

Edward V. Snider to be postmaster at Mosinee, Wis., in place of B. S. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1926.

Ethel F. Pilgrim to be postmaster at Menomonee Falls, Wis., in place of H. W. Graser. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1926.

William Kotvis to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Wis., in place of William Kotvis. Incumbent's commission expired August 12, 1926.

Otto C. Nienas to be postmaster at Camp Douglas, Wis., in place of O. C. Nienas. Incumbent's commission expired August 12, 1926.

Lyle H. Nolop to be postmaster at Alma Center, Wis., in place of L. H. Nolop. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1926.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1927

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION

John P. Johnson to be commissioner, port of Boston, Mass.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Lindsay B. Phillips to be attorney for the western district of Tennessee.

Stanley M. Ryan to be attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Andrew J. Russell to be marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

JUDGE OF MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George C. Aukam to be judge of the municipal court, District of Columbia.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be commanders

Harold T. Smith.
Mark L. Hersey.

To be lieutenant commanders

William M. Fechteler.
Charles A. Baker.
Byron S. Dague.
Alfred P. H. Tawresey.
John H. Buchanan.
Herman A. Spanagel.
Joseph R. Redman.
Theodore D. Westfall.
Theodore D. Ruddock.
William K. Harrill.
Alfred H. Balsley.
William E. Malloy.
Greene W. Dugger, jr.
John M. Creighton.
Charles D. Swain.
Edmund W. Burrough.
Albert H. Rooks.
Byron B. Ralston.
Thomas N. Vinson.
Herbert J. Ray.
John G. Moyer.

Archibald N. Offley.
Richard L. Conolly.
William A. Corn.
Thomas L. Nash.
Edwin T. Short.
John B. W. Waller.
Thomas J. Doyle, jr.
Alexander R. Early.
Vincent A. Clarke, jr.
Kemp C. Christian.
Benjamin F. Perry.
Richard W. Bates.
James M. Shoemaker.
Gerard H. Wood.
Melville C. Partello.
Robert O. Glover.
Archie E. Glann.
Edward E. Hazlett, jr.
John C. Lusk.
George P. Lamont.

To be lieutenants

Kenneth C. Caldwell.
Marshall A. Anderson.
Elmer S. Stoker.
John B. Lyon.
Campbell Cleave.
William E. Miller.
Charles M. Abson.
James H. Doyle.
Harry E. Padley.
Neill D. Brantly.
Charles D. Murphey.
Elmer F. Helmkamp.
William P. Hepburn.
Jim T. Acree.
Charles L. Surran.
George B. Cunningham.
Solomon S. Isquith.
Edwin C. Bain.
Norman S. Ives.
Bailey Connelly.
Edward H. Doolin.
William Hibbs.
Marvin H. Grove.
Gyle D. Conrad.
Clayton S. Isgrig.
Philip R. Kinney.

John A. McDonnell.
James A. Crocker.
Harold Coldwell.
Paul R. Sterling.
Benjamin N. Ward.
Ferguson B. Bryan.
William G. Livingstone.
Frederick R. Buse.
Charles L. Hutton.
Allan D. Blackledge.
Thomas H. Binford.
Thomas T. Craven.
Perley E. Pendleton.
Walton W. Smith.
Richard P. Glass.
Hance C. Hamilton.
John V. McElduff.
Khem W. Palmer.
David A. Hughes.
Hilyer F. Gearing.
William Butler, jr.
Jesse G. Johnson.
Joseph J. Rochefort.
Andrew T. Lamore.
Arthur S. Billings.
Frank A. Davis.

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Peter W. Haas, jr.

To be dental surgeons

Eugene LeR. Walter. Walter Rehrauer.
Eric G. Hoylman. Harry L. Kalen.
Andrew L. Burleigh. Philip H. MacInnis.
Joseph A. Kelly.

To be pay director

William L. F. Simonpietri.

To be passed assistant paymasters

William S. Cooper.
Christian P. Schwarz.
John N. Silke.

To be naval constructors

Russell S. Hitchcock. Douglas W. Coe.
Arthur C. Miles. Norborne L. Rawlings.
Sidney E. Dudley. Homer N. Wallin.
Grover C. Klein. Joseph W. Fowler.
Frederick E. Haeberle. William J. Malone.
Edmund E. Brady, jr. Lawrence B. Richardson.
Andrew I. McKee. Ralph S. McDowell.
Henry R. Oster. John D. Crecca.
Theodore L. Schumacher. William C. Wade.

To be civil engineers

Fritz C. Nyland. Andrew G. Bisset.
Ira P. Griffen. Theron A. Hartung.
Lewis N. Moeller. Herbert S. Bear.
Carl H. Cotter.

To be chief gunners

Michael J. Jones. William M. Coles.

To be chief machinist

John R. Rayhart.

To be chief pay clerks

Joseph L. Formans.
Charles A. Young.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Frederick Weik, Glendora.

PENNSYLVANIA

George Nuckid, Lyndora.
Stephen J. Downs, Union City.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 4, 1927

POSTMASTER

FLORIDA

William L. Clarke, jr., to be postmaster at Naples in the State of Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, January 4, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Thy love is infinitely broader than the measure of man's mind; and how much we thank Thee, blessed Lord, that we are still within the shadow of Thy care. To-day is another blessing for each of us, and may good thoughts and wise words be the issues of our lives. Enlarge the range of our understanding and give us a deep concern for the things which are related to our country's welfare. In Thy light may we see light and strive for the highest good. Do Thou bless and direct the Members of this Chamber that they may honor the land which has honored them. In every way may we labor for the best possible results by being the best possible men. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SOBRIETY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, in the debate of yesterday the statement was made by one of the Members from New York that "many Members of Congress drink to excess." I suppose he referred to intoxicating liquor. It does not appear in the RECORD in that language. The RECORD can be corrected or changed, but it does appear in the columns of the press and will probably be reported all over this Nation in the language as quoted. That statement is not only a reflection upon every Member of Congress but is an indictment of every Member of Congress.

In the few moments I have I want to briefly give my experience since I have been a Member of the House in as calm a manner as my indignation will permit. I have been a Member of this body for six years. During that time I have been a constant attendant upon the meetings of the House. I have never seen but one Member on the floor of this Chamber under the influence of liquor and he only served one term. He was defeated for reelection. I have never in the corridors of the House Office Building seen but four other Members of this body under the influence of liquor. Two of those men are dead and the other two are not Members of the present body. I have lived during those six years at a hotel where an average each year of 100 Members of Congress make their abode during the session, and there day or night—and sometimes I am up rather late at night—I have never seen one single Member of Congress enter the doors of that hotel or leave the doors of that hotel under the influence of liquor.

I probably know as many Members of this body as any Member of Congress. Most of them I can call by their first name, and I count them all friends of mine. I have been the guest of many of them in their homes and at private dinner parties. I have yet to see liquor served on any of those occasions. I do not believe there is another body of 435 men, drawn from all walks of life, who indulge less in intoxicating liquors than the Members of this House. [Applause.] Even the comparative few who advocate a change in the Volstead law are not men who drink to excess or become intoxicated. No matter how enthusiastic those men may have been with reference to the principle involved or their opposition to the act I have never seen them in any way, shape, or manner under the influence of intoxicants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can not prevent the paragraphers of the press, we can not prevent the cheap comedian on the stage, we can not prevent the so-called humorist from casting aspersions and reflections upon this representative body, but each and every one of us can be jealous not only of our own reputation but of the reputations of our colleagues and of the people whom we represent. We can refrain from making such statements, and we can refute such statements as were made on the floor of this House yesterday.

I have not indulged in any of the controversies with reference to the benefits or the evils which have come to us from the eighteenth amendment. I try to live as I vote, and I believe the majority of the Members of this House do likewise. There are enough sins of omission and commission by Congress which may be severely criticized. If predicated upon fact and not upon fiction, no one will welcome or justify such criticisms sooner than I, but I want to spread upon the records of this House—and I trust the newspapers will give as much prominence to this statement as they have to the other one—that that statement made yesterday is an absolute and unqualified falsehood. [Applause.]

MALADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN BUREAU

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Indian welfare.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Indian welfare. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have discussed before the House many instances of gross injustice perpetrated on the American Indian under existing maladministration by the Indian Bureau. Many of these Indians are of a high order of intelligence and education. Due to their splendid patriotism during the World War, when thousands enlisted in the American Army and fought at the side of their white brothers under the same flag, Congress gave to all American Indians full rights of citizenship. Under the law such rights belong to them to-day.

In different speeches I have pointed out specific charges of mistreatment of the Indians through bureaucratic despotism found nowhere else in the world. These facts, rarely denied or explained, were presented by me for the purpose of securing a congressional investigation that will investigate actual conditions now prevailing among the Indians and obtain a constructive legislative program for Indian development to displace 70 years of hopeless Indian Bureau control.

The only serious offense lodged against the American Indian of to-day must be an offense of color, for no white man, black man, brown man, or yellow man in this country is subjected to the same control of person and property exercised over 225,000 Indians by the Indian Bureau. Indian property reported by the bureau to be valued at \$1,600,000,000 is absolutely controlled and managed by this despotic bureau without right of court review or of any of the constitutional rights possessed by all other American citizens. This is based on a strange despotically administered practice wherein all such Indians are declared "incompetent" by the bureau and while so held are unable to care for their property.

Without right to have their "competency" reviewed by any court or the administration of their property reviewed by any court these 225,000 Indians are completely helpless and deprived of constitutional rights and privileges enjoyed by all other citizens. Not in far-away Russia, India, or China but in 22 States of this country are such conditions found.

More serious than any property rights unjustly taken from these American citizens, the Indian Bureau, through its agents and \$10-a-month Indian "judges" appointed by the agents, illegally and despotically, without warrant of law, arrests and imprisonments, sometimes with ball and chain, Indians who are deprived of rights of attorney, jury, bail, appeal to any court, or constitutional privileges possessed and exercised by every other American citizen. Such instances I have heretofore described to the House.

HIGHWAY ROBBERY APPROVED BY THE INDIAN BUREAU

Specific charges of "highway robbery" of different Indian tribes have been placed before the House in cases where I now have personal knowledge of the facts, and I point out, among others, the \$100,000 Navajo Indian Tribe reimbursable charge for a white-tourist bridge, of no possible value to Indians, that was urged through Congress by the Indian Bureau. Equally indefensible charges have been made against the Pima and San Juan Indians, involving in these three recent cases alone with proposed highways upward of a million dollars, which are indefensible liens levied against these tribes that had no knowledge of the pendency of such legislation and were unrepresented before Congress, excepting by the Indian Bureau. "Highway robbery" of Indians is a term used in debate by Senators when discussing the Navajo bridge fraud. It is equally descriptive of other frauds on Indians to which I shall refer.

Neglect of health, startling mortality conditions among certain Indian tribes that frequently are alleged to be without sufficient food to sustain life, are among charges made that have not been answered or explained by the present Indian Bureau. A congressional investigation alone can develop facts that ought to be known by Congress and given to the country, with constructive proposals looking to the betterment of the American Indian.

A "RESEARCH COMMITTEE" APPOINTED BY THOSE TO BE INVESTIGATED

Smarting under criticisms and endeavoring to cover up a long record of Indian mistreatment, the Indian Bureau under Commissioner Burke has persuaded Secretary Work to name a "research committee" to investigate the bureau. Secretary Work's own course in recommending the Navajo Bridge to Congress shows his own ignorance of bureau methods or, if known, a consent that deserves equal condemnation to that merited by the despotic Indian Bureau.

Any committee so named by him under the guidance of Indian Bureau officials, from the commissioner to his army of reservation agents and employees, will be steered past the neglect and mistreatment found among many tribes and will be shown beautiful bridges, beautiful highways, beautiful nonresident Indian schools, and tables of beautiful bureau statistics that have in their shadows a story of neglect and oppression not to be whitewashed by any fairly selected congressional committee. Such a committee from Congress Commissioner Burke fears will be "partisan." If partisan sufficiently to give the American Indians a fair deal and reveal the present despotic system of illegal, unjust, and neglectful Indian Bureau control, then such "partisanship" should be welcomed.

Again, I repeat that in no civilized country the world over is an intelligent, moral, and exceptionally well-behaved people kept in such absolute subjection of person and property as are

our American Indians. Neither has autocracy ever measured up to the present unchallenged control of our Indian citizens exercised by the Indian Bureau, aided by its army of employees and, not to be forgotten, its \$10-per-month Indian judges.

SPECIFIC CHARGES OF MALFEASANCE BY THE INDIAN BUREAU

Charges definite and certain were made in speeches of February 4, March 4 and 23, and April 23 of gross malfeasance on the part of Indian Bureau officials, and an investigation by Congress asked for to get the facts, and to secure some constructive legislation for the benefit of a large army of the Nation's Indian wards who have been given their citizenship by Congress. In these speeches, with affidavits and facts presented, I have tried as far as possible to avoid needless duplication.

At the beginning of the Sixty-ninth Congress I was informed by Republican Leader TILSON that my experience in Congress should be useful in helping to improve the Government's treatment of Indians and that I was given an assignment on the Indian Committee for that reason. This assignment was made without prior knowledge or request on my part.

Believing that the assignment called for real service, and that such was the purpose of the transfer, I have given some study to the subject of Indian welfare, consulting works of former Indian commissioners, and whatever investigations or other reports were available. Needless to say I have had no personal prejudices and no purpose at any time to misrepresent the person or the administration of Indian Commissioner Burke or any of his subordinates, or of his superior, Secretary of the Interior, Doctor Work. On the other hand, I have not hesitated to expose conditions concerning Indian affairs exactly as found, although some official might thereby be called upon to explain neglect or misconduct of the Indian Bureau's administration.

Without any request for the committee assignment, as stated, I have carried out my duties on the Indian Committee as I conceived them to be. Possibly this statement is needless to make, because Commissioner Burke in his "defense" before the Indian Committee very properly exonerated me from any purpose to misrepresent, and further said he had no quarrel with me, whom he termed his friend and former colleague. That spirit is reciprocal. My work has been entirely impersonal; and if in an effort to disclose intolerable conditions among the Indians I reflect upon the Indian Bureau or any official, it is immaterial to me whether the fault lies with Commissioner Burke, his assistant Mr. Meritt, or any other subordinate, or with Secretary Work, his superior, or whether it is due to some predecessor, for I will not willingly misstate any matter. On the other hand, I will give what I believe to be the facts, whether they reflect upon the Indian Bureau or upon Congress that, through ill-considered laws, allow such things to exist.

A statement recently given to the press by Secretary Work, "approved by Indian Commissioner Burke," says that Doctor Work has appointed another "commission of investigation" to study charges against the Indian Bureau, which commission will report next year. If I believed that commission or any other commission of like character so appointed would accomplish anything, or that the indescribable helplessness of the Indians would be relieved by this bureau investigation of its own affairs or by any similar body, I would await results. No one experienced in such matters will place any confidence in such an investigation.

From past experience I submit that it is only a temporary makeshift to allay deserved criticism of bureau neglect and that no needed relief for the Indians nor genuine reform in treatment of these wards of the Government can ever come about through such investigations by the Indian Bureau or by the Department of the Interior or by any agency appointed or recommended by either. No good reason, I submit, exists for opposition by the bureau to a congressional investigation excepting a fear of having its maladministration exposed.

OTHER COMMITTEES UNDER LIKE APPOINTMENTS

When Secretary Work was first appointed Secretary he appointed a committee of 100 to study Indian matters because of serious criticisms then made against the Indian Bureau. The commission, composed of estimable men, gave the kind of investigation that might be expected, although it is of record that specific health recommendations were urged. Neither Secretary Work nor Commissioner Burke nor their subordinates have alleviated the health conditions of the Indians as recommended, nor have recommendations of the committee to that end been followed with legislation.

I submit it is the height of folly to have another investigation by the bureau of itself. Any investigation to be of value must come from Congress, and such an investigation I called for last session, setting forth charges of maladministration in the Indian Office that then required and now invite a congressional

investigation. Such an investigation would properly conclude with a constructive program for the betterment of the Indians—a program that never will be accepted voluntarily by any bureau which primarily seeks to perpetuate itself.

I learned upon my first visit to the Indian Committee of the House that before any bill affecting Indians was taken up by the committee for consideration it was first sent to the Indian Bureau for its approval and that the report which came back to the committee, signed by Secretary Work, generally determined the fate of the bill. Only one bill opposed by the Indian Bureau was passed by the House committee out of the first 35 bills last session reported by that committee. In the Senate the bureau locked horns over that single bill. The statements of Meritt, recently made before California audiences, may be construed fairly as an ultimatum that no legislation disapproved by the czarlike Indian Bureau will be passed by Congress.

THE INDIAN BUREAU'S CONTROL OF LEGISLATION

Out of several bills that I introduced that would have given Indians or the courts of the country some slight control over Indian property, all without exception were rejected by the Indian Bureau, and none ever reached the stage of consideration by the House. Members of the House or Senate will do well to act with circumspection on Indian matters and not offend the Indian Bureau if they have bills to propose for the relief of Indians in their States. That preposterous situation I learn has long existed. I am again presenting facts that, if true, should cause every American, as a matter of self-respect, to demand a new deal for the only real American whose numbers have been decreased through disease, starvation, and long-continued neglect. Those for whom the Government is accountable in all the States, to the number of 225,000, should be given the protection that is their due. When making his reply to my charges of bureau inefficiency, neglect, and illegal acts, Commissioner Burke said to the committee, on April 10 last, on page 7 of the hearings:

I want at the outset to exonerate Mr. FREAR from having possibly made some misleading statements, and statements that are inaccurate, and perhaps not true, because it is very apparent that he has made no study of the subject. * * *

After three hours uninterrupted attempted "defense" by Indian Commissioner Burke before the Indian Affairs Committee, and the refusal of the committee to give Secretary Collier, of the Indian Defense Association, any right to reply, I reiterated in the House that Mr. Burke's Indian Bureau defense was practically a case of confession and avoidance and that he admitted some of the most important charges, and by his silence and failure to deny had admitted certain other charges of malfeasance laid against the Indian Bureau.

PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF INDIAN BUREAU INJUSTICE

The statement made by Indian Commissioner Burke last session that I was without personal knowledge of Indians or of the field work of the Indian Bureau was fairly well taken at the time, as is the statement of an attorney that the opposing counsel is without personal knowledge of a case under consideration, excepting as it may come to him from reputable witnesses. However, I accepted the criticism as fairly made that I was not personally a qualified witness to speak of some of the facts set forth in my charges. To meet that criticism, between September 12 and October 22 last, I drove 4,480 miles in an automobile, visiting some 20 Indian reservations, consulting with many Indian Bureau employees and with hundreds of Indians. In one council meeting of several that were held I met about 75 Indian duly selected delegates representing over 8,000 Indians. At Taos and at Zuni, and other places, I talked through interpreters with smaller councils, and in the fairly extended travels mentioned I discussed Indian conditions also with many white persons, who were neither connected with the Indian Bureau nor with any Indian tribes nor with any Indian Defense Associations.

I tried to get the facts, and the facts are bad enough without coloring. Only a few of these facts that deserve careful probe by a competent committee can be presented here.

Throughout this trip, made in company with John Collier, secretary of the American Indian Defense Association, I paid my own personal expenses, whether traveling by car or train. This statement is volunteered at the outset in order to explain a freedom from obligation to anyone and that I did not use the funds of any Indian association or any other organization for my personal needs. These organizations, composed of splendid men and women throughout the West, are interested in Indian welfare, through knowledge of injustice practiced toward the Indians that in some cases has reached appalling conditions

because of disease and neglect. Of hundreds whom I met in the various cities or other communities of the West connected with such organizations many had personal knowledge of the facts through their own visits among the different tribes. To evidence the high character of the membership I quote from a statement previously made to the House a few names of those connected as responsible members of its board of directors with one Indian defense society:

Dr. Haven Emerson, New York City (professor of public health administration, Columbia University); Irving Bacheller, New York City (novelist); Robert E. Ely (director of the Town Hall, New York City); Mrs. H. A. Atwood, Riverside, Calif. (chairman Indian welfare division, General Federation of Women's Clubs); William Allen White, Emporia, Kans. (editor); James Ford (professor, social ethics department, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.); Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant, New York City (author and authority on Indians); Charles F. Lummis, Los Angeles, Calif. (author and authority on Indians); Rev. E. P. Wheeler, Aurora, Ill. (40 years a missionary among the Indians); William Kent, Kentfield, Calif. (former Congressman); Dr. Aurelia H. Reinhardt (president Mills College, Calif.); Stewart Edward White, San Francisco, Calif. (author); Dr. Walter M. Dickie, Berkeley, Calif. (secretary California Board of Health); Dr. William Palmer Lucas (professor pediatrics, University of California); Edyth Tate Thompson, Fresno, Calif. (secretary California Tuberculosis Association); Dr. John R. Haynes (regent, University of California; member Los Angeles Public Service Commission); Dr. Henry J. Ullman (president American Legion, Santa Barbara, Calif.); Mrs. Mary Austin, Santa Fe (author); James W. Young, Chicago; Fred M. Stejn, New York City; Gertrude Bonnin, Washington (president National Association of American Indians); Jay B. Nash (professor, school of education, New York University); Walter V. Woehlke, Ross, Calif.; Mrs. Frank A. Gibson, Los Angeles; Mary J. Workman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Rev. Father Robert Lucey, Los Angeles, and Raymond K. Armsby, Burlingame, Calif.

The national advisory board of the association includes Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., George Haven Putman, Henry W. Taft, Adolph Lewisohn, Dr. John H. Finley, Dan C. Beard, George Foster Peabody, Right Rev. Monsignor J. P. Chidwick, and the Right Rev. W. C. Manning.

Many of these people, including Secretary Collier, have lived among the Indians, know their conditions, and enjoy their confidence.

From personal acquaintance with many of those I met in Western States I am certain their interest in the American Indian has been of great value to the Indians and to a limited extent has exposed and opposed successfully legislation approved by the Indian Bureau which was calculated to bring injury to these wards of the Government.

ADVERSE CRITICISM WHEN OF SERVICE

Let me further say that on my trip of nearly 4,500 miles by automobile I found Indian Bureau employees, including agents, physicians, and nurses, who talked freely when assured their names would not be used, and some of the most important facts learned came from such sources. Thanks to Indian Commissioner Burke's speech before the Indian Committee that had been circulated throughout all Indian reservations, it served a useful purpose, due to its personal criticisms of myself and Secretary Collier, for the bureau employees knew we were in no way connected with the bureau's purposes or policies and that they were in no danger of being transferred with their families to distant reservations or of losing their retirement-fund rights if the actual facts and their sympathies were made known to us. Two or three agents were noticeably hostile, and one of the latter declared every Indian was worthless and undeserving of sympathy. Before I could inquire on what facts he based that judgment he added that, in his opinion, about all the whites were equally worthless. This agent, however, was not as bad as he wished to appear, for he thawed out before I left and told me of several praiseworthy things he, the agent, had done for the Indians.

Charges against Indian bureaucracy and the lack of any Indian welfare constructive policy were, however, found nearly everywhere we visited, with concessions occasionally grudgingly made by bureau officials to meet specific criticisms which had exposed indefensible conditions.

Based on my trip irrespective of personal study of reports and other investigations I am prepared to say that I believe every charge contained in my former request for an investigation is substantially accurate even though previously made in part from outside information. If Indian Commissioner Burke and Mr. Meritt had not inferentially admitted some of the charges and by their silence as to others impliedly admitted the truth of official malfeasance, the facts I have

studied in the field are such that I reiterate every charge I have made and offer to furnish witnesses in many cases who are familiar with the facts.

CHARGES HERETOFORE MADE NOT AGAIN SET FORTH IN DETAIL

In my request last spring for an investigation of the Indian Bureau I made a dozen or more specific charges. In order to present these and other charges against the Indian Bureau in chronological order let me say that on February 4, last, I made direct charges in the House of specific misrepresentation to Congress by the Indian Bureau and malfeasance in the Indian Office affecting a \$100,000 reimbursable charge against the Navajo Tribe last session, recommended by Secretary Work, on the advice presumably of Commissioner Burke. That charge I am prepared to say was, if anything, an understatement of the situation. The facts are hardly believable but I am ready to bring many witnesses, whites or Indians, who will support Senator CAMERON's assertion in debate that the bridge charge is "highway robbery" of the Indians and also Senator BRATTON's equally specific charge that the action of the Indian Bureau in this case was "iniquitous." Not one reputable witness, I predict, will deny this indictment of the Indian Bureau's highway robbery of this tribe and of the bureau's misstatement of facts to Congress when the bill was passed.

On March 4 I made in the House additional charges that without any law or justification therefor the Indian Bureau, through its agents, for years had jailed Indians, sometimes for misdemeanors and occasionally with ball and chain punishment. Such jailing was without any legal trial, without attorney, without right to jury, without any rights to bail or appeal to the courts, and against the protection to which these Indian citizens are entitled under the Constitution. That charge was supported by several Indians then in Washington.

On March 23 I made equally specific charges against the Indian Bureau for its attempt to force through Congress an oil leasing bill on Indian lands so unjust and unprecedented and against all Indian rights that on a mere statement of facts the bureau withdrew its efforts to press the 37½ per cent Indian tax provision that unjustly had previously passed both Houses of Congress or any opposition to a just bill that eventually passed both Houses but was vetoed by the President—not because of any lack of protection given to the Indians but because of demands of other outside oil interests to be included in the bill.

MISLEADING INDIAN BUREAU STATISTICS

Commissioner Burke has stated that \$90,000,000 in money or securities and \$1,600,000,000 in property belonging to 225,000 Indians is held under the control of the Indian Bureau, notwithstanding all adult Indians are full-fledged American citizens, made such by act of Congress. This property, of course, is unequally distributed and thousands of so-called incompetent Indians are not far removed from starvation and are without any property of material value from which to make a livelihood. During the past century most of the Indian tribes have been pushed back into the mountains or onto desert land where no white man could exist and where in many cases Indians have been robbed of their prior water rights, necessary to any use of the land.

When oil, minerals, or even exceptional building stone has been discovered in rare instances on Indian lands the watchful white man has immediately been in readiness to dispossess the Indian where possible to do so, and bureau agents have often recommended such dispossession.

The Secretary of the Interior occupies the anomalous position of being the head of the Bureau of Public Lands and of the Indian Bureau and also of the National Park Service. As such head of the General Land Office, Secretary of the Interior Fall sought to take from the Indians all oil and mineral rights contained in 22,000,000 acres of Executive-order Indian reservations. In so doing, he endeavored to take away from the Indians, of whose property and persons he was primarily the guardian, all oil and mineral rights from two-thirds of their lands.

The Park Director is desirous of enlarging the national-park area and is constantly urging that Indian lands adjoining national parks, if usable for park purposes, shall be detached and taken from the Indian and that approaches to parks across Indian lands be made at their expense. His demands are made upon the Secretary of the Interior, who is by law also the official guardian of our Indian wards.

Between these two insistent factors always in Washington and on the ground the Indian has no voice or influence excepting through the Indian Bureau and often it occurs that the Indian Bureau joins hands with either one or the other bureaus engaged in robbing these wards of the Government. For years these Indians have been kept helpless, and they are, under ex-

isting conditions, to be kept helpless to the end of time for the self-perpetuation of the Indian Bureau.

NO DECREASE IN "INCOMPETENT" INDIANS UNDER BURKE

In September, 1917, or seven years ago, Indian Commissioner Sells testified before a House investigation committee that 220,000 "incompetent" Indians were under his care, although 9,000 others had been declared competent within the five or six preceding years. Commissioner Sells also stated that the "competency commission" then consisted of the local Indian agent, a second man known as a special agent or official of the Indian Bureau, and a third man appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. These three men acted under the Indian Commissioner, who had the power to move or remove two of them at his pleasure. Six years thereafter the number of restricted Indians had increased to 225,000, instead of decreasing, as the Indian Office now states. During one year, from 1924 to 1925, the Indian property of these "incompetents" increased over \$600,000,000, or more than 50 per cent increase, during 1925, according to bureau statistics.

The fallacy is equally apparent of the bureau's argument as to per capita wealth of the American Indian. Such Indian wealth is largely composed of a few oil wells belonging to certain Indians; of millions of acres of desert or unproductive lands that no white man will live on or use; of timberlands in some cases where the tribe's timber, without their approval or consent, is being wiped out with negro labor, as in the case of the Apaches, not primarily for the benefit of the Indians but to help support the Indian Bureau, with a loss in timber supply as wasteful and improvident as the loss of our northern pineries; and lastly, the Indian Bureau's case of per capita wealth may be exposed by its own statistics to be little value unless verified. The 225,000 incompetent Indians are credited with a total wealth in 1924 of \$1,052,849,047, and in 1926 that enormous paper total is reported to have increased to \$1,656,046,550, or over 50 per cent in one year. Indian wealth, like Indian census figures and Indian health statistics, should be subjected to close scrutiny.

WHO OWNS THE INDIANS' "WEALTH"?

Practically the entire increase in wealth claimed by the Indian Bureau is from oil wells in a limited district and wealth that belongs to a small fraction of the total number of Indians. Not 5 per cent of the total number of Indians probably have reaped any benefit, direct or indirect, from the oil wells, yet the camouflage proposition of wealth per capita is made to cover starving Indians from Fort Peck Reservation, on the Canadian border, to the Pimas, 2,000 miles distant in Arizona.

The discovery of oil in Oklahoma is of no more value to the Fort Peck or Hopi or Plutes or Pimas or Klamaths than the wealth of the Czar's family was to the Russian serf. A \$56,000,000 diamond crown for the Czar or a \$1,100,000 Jackson Barnett fortune made in Oklahoma oil divided by Commissioner Burke between a mission and a kidnapping wife, with extras to Attorneys McGuggan and Mott and others, by no possibility can add one farthing to the wealth of the poverty-stricken California Indians or to 95 per cent of nearly 200 other tribes that have no more interest in nor right to any Oklahoma Indians' oil wealth than they have to the diamonds in the Czar's crown.

A bare statement of the case illustrates the specious, almost childlike, wealth argument characteristic of Indian Bureau methods of news releases when estimating increases of Indian property, increase in population, health statistics, and other claims all sadly in need of authentic confirmation. Needless to say I have no interest to serve other than that of the Indians whom I believe to be grossly mistreated and misgoverned under the present system. My statements at variance with the bureau's showing are based on what I believe to be more reliable information than that gained through bureau "statistics." They are offered primarily to induce Congress either in the House or preferably in the Senate where investigations are more easily had, and possibly more thorough, to give this subject of Indian misgovernment, for which Congress is primarily responsible, the study, investigation, and legislation it imperatively needs. Statements by bureau officials of increase in Indian population are specious and misleading as will be readily seen in an analysis that I shall offer later in my remarks. Conceding, however, for the sake of argument, that an element of truth exists in either case, the charges of specific misuse of property and of Indian persons repeatedly made have not been answered. That is an issue that requires real investigation.

RESULTS OF INDIAN BUREAU CONTROL

One purpose in traveling through these reservations was to study present methods of Indian control, and I submit that the progress in constructive help since the days of the first commissioner, Elbert Herrling, in 1832, down to date, covering

nearly a century, would make a turtle's pace a real marathon race by comparison.

This is not accidental, for \$1,600,000,000, the bureau Indian property estimate, is a nice, juicy plum to control, and \$90,000,000 in securities a fine sum of money to handle where no responsibility exists for interest or investments and where no board of directors can meddle and no judge can interfere as in other cases of trusteeship or guardianship. Yet starving Indians are with us to-day, if sworn statements and reports from authentic sources are to be believed.

I shall not attempt to cover any considerable portion of complaints received against the Indian Bureau system, complaints that go back for 70 years against a bureau that is petrified or ossified and directly responsible for conditions among the Indians of to-day. Often the bureau has openly joined with white plunderers in despoiling the Indian. I am prepared to submit evidence which must carry conviction to any unprejudiced mind that this is practiced to-day. Near the outset of my 4,500 mile trip, which began in Montana, I met delegations from Fort Peck, Flathead, and other tribes, including five Indians who drove a Chevrolet car 500 miles, day and night, to lay before me and others their charge that the Fort Peck Indians living near the Canadian border were close to starvation. Later on our trip I had reason to believe other tribes were living on half rations or less and because of no fault on their part, but due to mismanagement and mistreatment from the Indian Bureau.

STARVING INDIANS ONCE ATE DOGS AND HORSES—LITTLE FOOD NOW

I asked one of the Fort Peck Indians, who impressed me with his intelligence, honesty, and straightforwardness, to send a sworn statement of conditions on that reservation. This he has done, and as late as December 28, 1926, he swears to a state of facts on his reservation that in itself should start a congressional investigation. If we can get exercised over starving poor in China and Armenia, where we have no direct responsibility for conditions, what will be said of our direct responsibility for many tribes of Indians among whom poverty like that set forth in this affidavit is common to all members of the tribe? The affidavit just received is as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,

County of Roosevelt, ss:

Martin Mitchell, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says: I am now 57 years of age, a member of the Fort Peck Assinibolne Tribe, born in Montana, and reside in the city of Wolf Point, Mont.

If we are poor to-day, it is not our fault; it is the Indian Bureau's fault. If the Indian Bureau left us alone we would be better off.

In about 1880 these Indians (Assinibolnes) were about 2,000 in number, but to-day they are a little over 600. In about 1881 the Indian Bureau gave orders to kill off all the buffalo; before the buffalo were killed the Indians were all strong and healthy and no disease among them. After the buffalo were all killed I remember the Indian agent told the Indians, "Now your buffaloes are all killed and gone, and now you have to stay here on the reservation, and we are going to feed you," and that winter it was a hard winter; the Indians were starving. They gave us rations once a week—just enough to last one day—and the Indians they started to eat their pet dogs; after they ate all their dogs up they started to eat their ponies. All this time the Indian Bureau had a warehouse full of grub; they stationed seven Indian policemen at the door so the Indians could not get at the food; this all happened in the winter of 1883 and 1884. Some of the Indians—their whole families starved to death. Early that spring I saw the dead bodies of the Indians wrapped in blankets and piled up like cordwood in the village of Wolf Point, and the other Indians were so weak they could not bury their dead. What were left were nothing but skeletons. I think the Indian Bureau should have been prosecuted for murder or manslaughter at that time. That was the hardest time endured by the Assinibolne Indians since coming on this reservation. Now I think we are about to go through the same thing.

About a year after our hard times the Government issued a cow to each of them; it was no time when every one of us had a nice bunch of cattle. Every fall we used to ship a trainload of cattle to the markets in Chicago. We were happy, we had plenty, we had nothing to worry about. But this did not look good to the Indian Bureau; they leased our reservation to a big cattle company against our will and protest. In one year after that we were broke. We were flat broke again. Then we sold a gravel pit to the railway company and we got \$2,000. Then we bought sheep with that money; 400 ewes, tribal herd. We all pitched in and built sheds and put up the hay. Our intentions were when we got about 5,000 head we were going to divide up among the Indians and go into sheep business; that was our intentions. When we got about 2,000 head, the Indian Bureau sold them all, and then they bought us some poor heifers and we got one apiece; now we started in the cattle business; it was not long when we had a bunch of cattle, every one of us; we were happy again. Then the Indian Bureau leased our reservation to a big cattle

outfit again and in one year we were all flat broke. So we do not know what to do now if the Indian Bureau does things against our will and keeps us broke all the time.

The way it looks to me we could be better off a hundred times without the Indian Bureau.

It just puzzles me how these Indians are going to pull through this winter; we had no crop and no hay; we had a per capita payment this month, \$50 apiece, but we were broke the next day. The traders were good enough to keep us from starving, and we gladly paid our bills. Of course we did not all get the \$50, because the Indian Bureau collected as much as they could for reimbursable loans. Now, we can't stand it much longer under the present administration. The Indian Bureau has got to change their system; they ought to reorganize it, and if they do, first thing they ought to call in all the Indian inspectors and pay them off. They are the ones who cause us all our troubles. They just go around whitewashing everything. The Government can't find out anything about the true conditions of the Indians from those sports. You must have special inspectors if you want to find out anything. Ever since I can remember there have been over a thousand inspectors visited us; only one, F. E. Leupp, did the right thing. He was sent by President Roosevelt.

If given opportunity, I will present more facts and evidence about the hardships the Indians would have to endure during this winter; that possibly some of them would starve to death, unless aid was extended to them.

I know this is going to be pretty tough on me for making this statement, but I must tell the truth and I don't care what they do to me; I want to save my people.

MARTIN MITCHELL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of December, A. D. 1926.

C. L. ROGERS,

Notary Public for the State of Montana.

Evidence of similar conditions among the Pimas, Klamaths, and other tribes, I am assured, can be furnished to any congressional investigating committee.

"HIGHWAY ROBBERY" OF INDIANS BY THE BUREAU

I have stated that the Indian Commissioner has approved legislative robbing of the Indians. I will not knowingly misstate any case and so give specific facts that from personal examination I now know to be true. Last session I protested in the House vigorously against the passage of the \$100,000 charge against the Navajo Indians for a bridge at Lees Ferry. Senators in debate then declared the charge to be "highway robbery" of the Indians. They were right, in my judgment, in use of that expression.

Secretary Work reported to Congress on this bridge that—

The bridge will furnish an important outlet for the Navajo Indians, facilitating their communication with the whites and assisting them in their progress to a more advanced civilization. In view of the fact that they will derive great benefit from the proposed bridge, estimated to equal the benefit which will be derived by the white settlers, it would be reasonable that the \$100,000 be made reimbursable to the United States and remain a charge upon the lands and funds of these Indians until paid.

It is no exaggeration to say that the statement quoted from the report, which I assume Secretary Work signed unknowingly, was absolutely false from beginning to end. The Indian Bureau could not have been innocent, when it not only violated its express duty to protect the Indians in their property rights but supported a successful effort to mislead Congress when robbing this defenseless tribe. No Indian was called to Washington to testify before any committee. Out of 34,000 Indians, the bureau saw to it that none came to tell Congress the truth.

Last session Senator CAMERON, Republican, of Arizona, called this act of the Indian Bureau "highway robbery." In company with Senator BRATTON, Democrat, of New Mexico, who called it "an iniquity," CAMERON and a handful of Senators held the bill up for many days, as I have heretofore stated, although the imperative importance of a great appropriation bill over other interests made its early passage necessary. All of these facts I set forth in speech of April 23.

Not one Senator in debate gave any reason for the \$100,000 bridge nor defended the brazen injustice to the Navajos that results from the reimbursable charge. Not one employee of the Indian Bureau, I submit, will offer any reasonable excuse for the successful effort to deceive Congress. I will not repeat evidence offered in my speeches in the House of February 4 and of April 23, wherein many witnesses were quoted against the bridge who had personal knowledge of the farcical saddling onto an Indian tribe of \$100,000 in order to help a white tourist concern. These statements were not and can not be successfully answered by the Indian Bureau. If the Indian Bureau would rob the Navajo Tribe of \$100,000 for a bridge, it would rob other Indians of a greater amount when given

opportunity. This has been done by the present Indian Bureau, as I am prepared to show, but first I wish to add some personal, definite knowledge of the character of the Lees Ferry Navajo Bridge fraud that was put through Congress by gross misrepresentation.

FACTS NOT PLACED BEFORE CONGRESS

This bridge is to be built across the Colorado River at the nearest point above the Grand Canyon where a bridge crossing is practicable. The point selected is approximately 75 miles or more above the Angel Trail, but due to the circuitous trail necessary to reach the ferry landing, the distance from what is known as the south rim to the north rim across the canyon by way of Lees Ferry or the proposed bridge is not far from 200 miles, about equally distant on both sides from the ferry. After driving in our car south through Utah I drove from the north rim of the canyon by the nearest route to Lees Ferry and crossed the rope ferry over to the south side of the Colorado and thence down to the nearest settlement, Tuba City. This distance in miles seems trivial, but with the car used we frequently drove 50 to 60 miles an hour on good roads. It took from early morning until about 8 p. m. to cover the distance across the ferry, because it was impossible to average much over 10 miles an hour during part of the way.

No other roads north of the Colorado or on the south side connect at Lees Ferry or at any point within many miles of the ferry that we observed. We were on the only road traveled. I quote from the diary of the trip across the ferry made by me on September 22 and written on the following day at Tuba City:

We left the north rim [of the canyon] about 8 a. m. and drove about 45 miles to Jacobs Pool * * *. From Jacobs Pool we drove about 65 miles to Lees Ferry. Only one settler was met about halfway to the ferry. * * *. During the last 35 miles of the drive to the ferry we did not meet a soul on the road or see a tree or a single water hole. It was deserted excepting for a few scattered cattle during the 35 miles. Not a half dozen settlers live within 35 miles of the ferry, we were told.

We crossed at the ferry over the Colorado with Deputy Sheriff Moon running the rope ferry. He said the place was the last hole in creation. That he could handle all the traffic and averaged about two cars a day (\$3 each) during September.

We drove along the south side of the Colorado River for about 50 miles (on the Navajo Reservation), and it was as deserted for the entire distance as on the north side, excepting toward the last 20 miles we stopped at two small traders' shanties and saw several small Navajo hogans (houses), but it was almost as bad as on the north side, treeless and waterless, until near Tuba City, which we reached about 8 p. m.

NOT ONE INDIAN WITNESS CALLED BY THE BUREAU

Tuba "city" consists of a few reservation buildings, including a school and one trader's store. No other stores or industries. A small monthly pamphlet, published by the Indian Rights Association (Inc.), Philadelphia, and edited by M. K. Sniffen, contains the following in its October, 1926, number:

After visiting the proposed site for the Lees Ferry Bridge over the Colorado River, in Arizona, the editor does not wonder that the Navajo Indians object to having \$100,000 of their funds used for its construction. Not an Indian lives within 25 miles of the site on the reservation side, and the nearest settlement across the river is about 80 miles distant.

There is now no approach to the site, and if the bridge is ever built it will be necessary to construct a road across the western part of the Navajo Reservation that will cost not less than \$300,000. It is a white man's proposition and no stretch of imagination can justify using \$100,000 from the Navajo funds for such purpose.

This subject was discussed at the tribal council held at Fort Defiance in July, and while the Indians were willing to have funds derived from oil bonuses and rentals used for reservation improvements they were unanimously opposed to the Lees Ferry bridge scheme.

The Indian Rights organization is very conservative, rarely questioning any action of the Indian Bureau, so the foregoing is quoted to show that every witness familiar with the "highway robbery," as it is called by Senator CAMERON, agrees that no Indians or whites live or can live anywhere near this bridge. More significant, the Indians were "unanimously opposed to the Lees Ferry bridge scheme" put over by Secretary Work and the Indian Bureau.

CONGRESS NEGLECTS ITS INDIAN WARDS, BUT IS ASKED TO GRAB THEIR LAST DOLLARS FOR A TOURIST BRIDGE

Commissioner Sells felt some responsibility, which apparently has been overlooked by present bureau officials, when he said, on page 75 of the Snyder investigation of the Navajos living in New Mexico and Arizona—

The Indians of the Southwest, including the Navajos, the Napes, the Apaches, the Pimas, and the Papagoes have all been consider-

ably neglected. They have had very little help from the Government. * * * The Navajos have gone through all sorts of trouble.

No Indian was ever called to Washington when the bridge fraud was perpetrated on the Navajo tribe and also on Congress, which was misled into passing the bridge bill. With about \$900,000 reimbursable charges against the Navajo Indians by Congress on the recommendation of the Indian Bureau, we were advised last session that this tribe, the most backward of any in the country according to the bureau, had only \$116,000 with which to pay all debts shouldered onto the Indians by the bureau. The bureau's handling of reimbursable charges will be referred to later.

Believing it important to disclose the character of such charges recommended by the Indian Bureau against its wards, the Indians, I have searched for the truth in this Navajo case, and from the testimony submitted by Senators in debate, also from all the people we met within 50 miles and more of Lees Ferry bridge, whites and Indians, I firmly believe no greater fraud could have been perpetrated on Congress or against any Indian tribe than this Lees Ferry reimbursable charge of \$100,000 against the Navajo Indians, with \$300,000 more hereafter for roads and approaches to follow, all to be built, without shadow of doubt, for the white automobile tourist trade and not one dollar really expended for the benefit of Indians. This fraud, begun in the Sixty-eighth Congress and completed this year, is an evidence of Indian Bureau gross malfeasance and other charges against Indians are equally indefensible.

CUTTING MEDICAL SUPPLIES TO BUILD WHITE TOURIST BRIDGES

It should be remembered that these Navajo Indians are in great need of medical service, of education, and of the bare necessities of life. For instance, the doctor at Tuba City, nearly a hundred miles distant from the nearest railway station, admitted he had 7,000 Indians under his care scattered over a territory presumably 50 miles square or 2,500 square miles, with only one nurse. His small requisition for necessary medical supplies of about \$1,000 for 7,000 Navajo Indians, with other medical applications, I understand, was cut in half by the Indian Bureau. And that bureau approved and recommended a charge of \$100,000 against the Navajo Indians for a white tourist bridge, with \$300,000 more to follow if approaches are built as stated by witnesses, yet cuts needed medical supplies. Some of the information was not voluntarily given but a congressional committee would have little difficulty in learning the facts.

Why would Senators, during debate, Republicans and Democrats alike, familiar with the facts, charge the Indian Bureau with highway robbery and swindling of Indians, unless it is a fact, and if a fact why will Congress sit complacently by and permit itself to be drugged by these same officials? That question can not be lightly brushed aside when all witnesses are practically a unit in denouncing the fraud on Congress as well as on the Indians.

Commissioner Burke absolves himself from blame by shouldering it on the Secretary of the Interior when in his unique defense he said (p. 30):

The Bureau of Indian Affairs does not control the estate of the Indians. * * * I want to say that we have at the head of that department (Interior) a man from the West, who is a great physician, big hearted, a man who has not only got red blood in him but a great administrator, and I want to say to you that there will not be anything happen while he is Secretary of the Interior that will do injustice to the Indians.

How about this \$100,000 Navajo bridge robbery item that Secretary Work recommended to Congress, and the \$300,000 more to come, and a \$900,000 reimbursable charge now against the Navajos, and, in fact, how about many other fraudulent Indian bridge items. Did the red-blooded or blue-blooded Secretary know what he signed when he said the white settlers and the Indians would be equally benefited by the Lees Ferry Bridge and that \$100,000 was a fair charge for Congress to make against these Indians?

Did any Secretary of the Interior sign that recommendation to Congress without "doing injustice to the Indians," and with his manifold duties did he know what he was signing when he approved many other unjust bridge and irrigation items or deals like the kidnapping marriage and division of Jackson Barnett's \$1,000,000 of property which the Indian Bureau approved?

A RED-HANDED BUREAU UNDER A RED-BLOODED SECRETARY

I shall not attempt to fix the degree of responsibility to be borne by the Secretary or by the Indian Bureau for these matters, but some one is responsible not only for what has been done but for what will be done in the future, and Commissioner

Burke's effort to escape responsibility by a eulogy of the Secretary with "red blood" must not be taken too seriously.

In a speech made February 4, last, I said that from information I had then received, bridges had been built across the Rio Grande River on the San Juan and Cochiti Indian Reservations charged reimbursable against the Indians of those pueblos, and on that occasion I stated I was informed the San Juan Indians did not use the bridge one-tenth as often as white settlers who were given the use of the bridge at the exclusive expense of the Indians. During Indian Commissioner Burke's "defense" before the Indian Committee he said he did not get the same information I had received from others. When in New Mexico and Arizona I asked to cross the San Juan Bridge and examine conditions for myself. This I did, driving many miles for that purpose, and the only people crossing the bridge while I was there were several Mexican settlers living on the other side. On my return to the neighboring Indian village I asked the president of all the Pueblos—some 8,000 in number—what proportion of Indians used the San Juan Bridge, and he said he would ask the governor of the San Juan Pueblo, which he did, repeating several questions I asked him to answer. Less than 1 Indian to every 10 white persons use the bridge, the governor answered, and he did not know that the bridge or any part of it had been made reimbursable against his tribe. He was the head of that tribe and a man of fine intelligence, but how could he know what the Indian Office, 3,000 miles away in Washington, was doing with his funds when no witnesses were called before the San Juan fraud was put through Congress.

I submit that this charge of some \$40,000 against the San Juan Indians is without any justification and that no inaccuracy occurred in the indefensible San Juan Bridge charge made against Commissioner Burke. The Indian governor and others so testified. Mr. Burke's statement that Congress was to blame for the charge and not himself, as shown on page 10 of his defense, is much like his attempt to load responsibility for the Navajo bridge onto Secretary Work. Neither would have passed Congress without the approval of Commissioner Burke.

Congress would not have made the charge without the acquiescence of the Indian Commissioner, that is certain; and the facts show that with more than 10 white persons using this bridge to every Indian, the entire charge was made against the Indians recently in the same manner that \$100,000 was charged against the Navajos for a bridge that is absolutely of no value to them.

THE PIMA WHITE TOURIST BRIDGE ALSO "HIGHWAY ROBBERY"

One night about 50 miles from Phoenix, when driving out to an Indian reservation, we came to a modern stone and concrete bridge apparently nearly a quarter of a mile in length that stretched across a dry bed of the Gila, where water rarely flows and never interferes with automobile fording more than two or three days of the year—so we were told at the reservation. This expensive modern bridge structure, not yet completed, was surmounted with impressive lamp posts and large-sized globes every few feet apart, and it was connected with a modern gravelled road that would be a credit to any State for automobile travel.

We learned that the bridge and road were part of the direct tourist trunk line from Phoenix to Tucson, and so far as we could observe it was built in keeping with surroundings of Niagara Falls or some popular Washington suburb instead of the Arizona desert.

When we asked whence came the beautiful bridge with its ornamental lamp posts and heavy stone railings far out in the desert we were told it was a bridge and roadway that would cost nearly a half million dollars, built across part of the Pima Reservation, and forming part of the direct tourist trunk line between the two cities named, and was built in connection with an irrigation dam at the same point. The extra cost for the bridge was estimated by reservation people at several hundred thousand dollars.

The Indians on the reservation continue to cross at the ford where they have crossed for centuries, at a point a couple of miles or more above where the bridge stands, but where the village is located. To use the bridge they would have to drive 4 miles out of their way, we were told, whereas the ford is always used the year round, excepting on two or three days.

I asked an Indian interpreter how many Indians would ever use the great costly bridge, compared with the whites, and he said not one in a thousand, while others agreed the bridge is useless for any Indians. I asked who paid for the bridge, and was told they had heard it was part of an irrigation dam project and that the Indians were expected to foot the entire cost of bridge and ditch, that in all probability will reach nearly

a million dollars. I have not all the details as to the charge, but this tribe is known as the Pimas, whose death rate is several times that of the Whites in Arizona; and the white tourist bridge has increased the reimbursable cost to the Indians several hundred thousand dollars. This was made possible by Indian Bureau connivance.

Regarding this infamous Pima bridge fraud Meritt in his defense of the bureau's action said (p. 47):

When the Indian dies and his estate is settled we will require the heirs to reimburse the Government for this splendid benefit that is being extended to the Indians of that [Pima] reservation.

The Pima Indians are very poor and seek now to get a livelihood out of the parched earth by aid of a few irrigation wells. They are not the builders nor users of the ornamental bridge, but they will pay handsomely for the white man's bridge now building, which is another case of "highway robbery," unbelievable to those not acquainted with the facts. The best investment this Congress can make would be to send a committee throughout the Southwest to learn these facts for themselves and then put the commissioner and his assistant on the carpet. When Mr. Meritt read his address to an Oakland audience he professed to believe I was criticizing the Pima irrigation project. On page 106 of his questioning he admits this bridge "is a beautiful bridge" charged against the Pima Indians; yet these Indians have no use for it and were not consulted about it, but the bridge unquestionably is built for white tourists on the regular trunk highway between two Arizona cities.

Meritt says this bridge will be paid for by Indian heirs when Indians now living die, and as the death rate among the Pimas is several times as large as the rate among the whites it is a business element that should favorably impress Mr. Meritt, whose bureau has cut medical requisitions for Indians down to 50 per cent in cases I am ready to present to any real investigating committee.

PILING UP ILLEGAL REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AGAINST INDIANS

I am informed that in 1919 Assistant Commissioner Meritt stated before the House Indian Affairs Committee more than \$3,000,000 of reimbursable charges then existing against Indian property is illegitimate and ought to be wiped out. If so, I ask who made them illegitimate, and what effort has been made by the Secretary of the Interior or Indian Commissioner Burke during the last six years to right the wrong? If \$3,000,000 was illegitimate in 1919, I predict it is more than double that amount now, for which the Indian Bureau is responsible. Indian property is mortgaged for \$3,000,000 or \$5,000,000, or more, by congressional act, that admittedly is an improper charge; and yet the bureau, acquainted with the facts, makes no effort to relieve the Indians from this injustice, but piles up the fraudulent charges. On page 107 of his remarkable defense of the bureau, Mr. Meritt said of reimbursable items charged against Indians that their collection "is left to the discretion of the commissioner." Meritt or his bureau in the face of such successful efforts to mislead Congress on necessary Indian items come to us with fulsome praise for the Navajo and Pima bridges that are both without merit; yet that is bureau logic which goes with fraudulent Indian charges that can not be defended.

Nowhere else in all legislative procedure, I submit, will such power be found lodged with a single bureau official. Congress appropriates money from the Treasury. On approval of Mr. Burke it is made reimbursable whenever, if at all, Mr. Burke decides it should be paid. The fraud primarily practiced on Congress is without parallel in any other department of the Government, and with the Indians it is inconceivably unjust and indefensible. With the Pima white-tourist bridge it is highway robbery.

In 1919 the reimbursable charges against Indian property was about \$23,000,000, and it is a matter entirely within the knowledge of the Indian Bureau just how much these charges have grown since 1919. The commissioner decides what claims are to be paid and he alone. No report or publication by the Indian Bureau, to my knowledge, gives these facts that are of vital interest to the Indians and of more vital interest to Congress. What is being done with the charges and how are they being paid? For, of course, charges against the San Juan Indians of \$40,000 for a white man's bridge or \$400,000 against the Pimas for a white man's bridge can not be paid now from their tribal funds, and presumably never, because both tribes are poor and needy; nor should one dollar ever be repaid, in fact. Yet in 1919 hearings it was stated that more than \$8,000,000 had already been collected from different Indian tribes and applied on their reimbursable debts. Possibly one-half of the balance and more should be repealed, and those who have been responsible in deceiving Congress and robbing

the Indians on such items should be made to answer both to Congress and to the Indians.

With the Kaibab Tribe, which I visited, a few poor helpless Indians have been charged a reimbursable fee, and yet the only tribal income, so far as I could learn at the reservation, comes from poor grazing land that is leased at about 1½ cents per acre to white cattlemen and the receipts then used to buy a tribal herd, which in turn affords what little money is now used to pay for a tourist road through the reservation. This reimbursement is being made, I understand, by collecting a few needed dollars from these poverty-stricken Indians. The Indian Bureau has not waited for these Indians to die. They pay a few dollars that is squeezed out of the cattle deal, but it is worse than stealing from the blind, because they are poor and utterly helpless to resist the bureau's tourist "highway robbery."

Any committee that investigates the Indian question should, among its first duties, learn the total reimbursable charges against all the Indians, the amount chargeable against the different tribes, the purpose of the charge and whether ever proper or not, the ability of the Indians to pay toward such charge, and whether, as I am informed, some of these Indians not far removed from starvation, with little property of any value, are being squeezed and their insignificant income shaved by the Indian Bureau in order to meet grossly unjust charges.

MANY MILLIONS OF FRAUDULENT BUREAU INDIAN CHARGES

Many cases can be pointed out involving a total of millions of dollars charged reimbursable against different Indian tribes for bridges, highways, irrigation projects, and other purposes, largely to be used by white people, which, however, have been made a charge against the Indians. These are not all caused by the present Indian commissioner, Mr. Burke, for some of these so-called "improvements" for whites at Indian expense were made by Congress under the advice and approval of their predecessors in office. No cases, however, within the past half century, I assert, will be found more iniquitous or indefensible in character than the Navajo Indian \$100,000 highway bridge robbery or the Pima bridge, of great expense, with connecting highway charges that will follow both bridge charges.

Any system is vicious that permits any official or any bureau to prostitute his or its powers by robbing or permitting robbery of the helpless Indians. When the relation of guardianship and ward is involved the extent of the injustice is a hundredfold worse. I am not directing my charges alone to present or past officials but to an infamous system that permits such things to exist and of which they are a part.

No investigation of the Department of the Interior or Indian Bureau by itself will ever offer any exposure of corruption due to this practice. If an independent investigation by Congress can not develop an honest, responsible, helpful, and constructive policy for handling the Indian question, then the result will be of little value, but with "incompetent" Indians under the control of the bureau on the increase and oil-well Indian property increasing 50 per cent in value in one year, and present methods of handling funds and standards of autocratic guardianship irresponsibility as bad as related, a radical change is called for, and Congress is the only agency able to bring about such change.

JACKSON BARNETT SWINDLED BY AN ALLEGED INDIAN BUREAU CONSPIRACY

Many individual charges of injustice are brought against the Indian Bureau. It is unnecessary again to refer to them in detail where I have done so before, except to say that in one case to which Mr. Meritt referred, and which I discussed in speech of April 23, where a whitewashing investigation of the present commissioner by the House committee was had, in the Jackson Barnett case, a New York court has been examining into the proceeding to ascertain if sufficient fraud and injustice appears to set aside the gift of \$1,100,000 made by Barnett to his wife and a Baptist mission, equally divided in amounts of \$550,000 each. As heretofore stated, the charge was made by the Government's attorneys that Barnett's wife was formerly a widow of ill repute. It is set forth by a lengthy report of detectives that she helped get Barnett, a simple-minded Indian, drunk and kidnapped him, then married him, and then got the Indian commissioner to agree to a division of Barnett's property, as set forth, reserving only to him during Barnett's life an income from the property. The scandal surrounding the marriage, the speed in getting hold of Barnett's property, are all matters of record, but the most significant part lies in the fact that the Indian Bureau was not only a party to taking the fortune from this Indian, subject to the life's income, but no transfer could have been had without the approval of the Indian Bureau, and no court review is now to be had, according to the bureau's contention.

I have recited the facts heretofore in various speeches, including Secretary Work's letter to the President, but add

briefly that all papers in the case were signed by Barnett with his thumb print. The Associated Press report of the trial in New York stated that a guardian was appointed by the Oklahoma court to set aside and recover the \$550,000 given to the mission society and of the \$550,000 given to the wife. Of this latter amount it was also alleged, as heretofore stated, the wife paid Harold McGuggan, an attorney who was prime mover in the conspiracy, \$150,000, and Mr. McGuggan paid \$50,000 of this amount to M. L. Mott, described as a close friend of Commissioner of Indian Affairs Charles H. Burke.

In the Associated Press report of November 17 it was stated further that the United States Government, an intervening petitioner in the suit, decided to withdraw its allegations of fraud against Albert B. Fall, formerly Secretary of the Interior, and also against Charles H. Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

In other words, the Attorney General's office, representing the United States Government, withdrew its charge of fraud against Commissioner Burke, but alleged and contends the gift of his property was improperly made by Burke. Charges of "cupidity and stupidity" made against Fall and Burke by the guardian's attorney were heard by the court, but the question of the motive that actuated the Indian Commissioner to have McGuggan, an attorney, paid \$150,000, of which his friend Mr. Mott was paid \$50,000, and other peculiar earmarks in the case would not be investigated by any court where the case turned on other issues. That is a province of a real investigation committee.

On November 30 Bailey, guardian, seeking to protect Barnett against the fraudulent gift of all his property to his new wife and against the mission society, received his reward by his removal by an Oklahoma court in November. Whether the \$150,000 that was to go to one attorney under the division of his property, with \$50,000 of that amount to be paid Mott, the Indian Commissioner's friend, figured in the removal is not disclosed, but any effort of the guardian to protect his ward aroused every opposing interest that was to profit from the division of Barnett's property.

THE SACRED INDIAN BUREAU IS ABOVE ALL LAW

The reason given by the court for the removal is that the Interior Department (Indian Bureau) had the sole right to administer the \$1,100,000 property of Jackson Barnett. Without court review, or any accounting to any court, this decision holds in effect that all the property of the 225,000 restricted Indians is under exclusive jurisdiction of Indian Commissioner Burke. The only authority over the Indian Bureau is Congress; and with a multitude of matters occupying its attention, Congress can not review Mr. Burke's action. Until a constructive plan is adopted for the protection of the 225,000 so-called incompetent Indians a specific method of court review should be provided by law for all such cases.

On the one hand, the bureau aids or directs an Indian old and feeble-minded to give away practically all his property, over a million dollars in amount, and yet it holds 225,000 Indians of all standards of intelligence in subjection so that they can not sell, lease, or will their property, amounting to \$1,600,000,000, without the bureau's express consent.

The question of property rights as now controlled and administered by the Indian Bureau calls for a thorough overhauling and a constructive plan that will permit Indians without unnecessary delay to become self-supporting, worthy of the citizenship Congress has given to every adult Indian.

The entire subject is of vital importance to the Indians. It is of more importance to Congress that witnesses the deceit, fraud, and neglect which all too frequently accompanies a situation where an unrestricted bureau, not responsible to any court, has the handling of \$1,600,000,000 in property belonging to 225,000 "restricted" Indians.

I do not intend to repeat the record of neglect of health and general lack of proper care heretofore set forth in speeches in the House on the Indian Bureau's administration, but a brief mention of Indian Bureau inexcusable neglect is here offered.

INDIAN HEALTH AND MORTALITY STATISTICS

In a House congressional investigation into Indian affairs held in 1919 Assistant Commissioner Meritt, who recently read his speech to California audiences, made this statement on examination:

I think there is a higher death rate among Indians than among white people. That is especially so with children under 5 years of age, where the death rate is appalling.

He attributed the infant death rate to lack of proper care at childbirth and lack of proper food. Again he said:

It is my impression that the Indians are suffering more from tuberculosis now because of their new methods of living than formerly when they roamed the plains and forests.

Again—

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it true that there is a greater percentage of tuberculosis among the Indians when they are confined than when their reservations were larger?

Mr. MERITT. We have no accurate figures as to the percentage of tubercular Indians a great many years ago, but now we have figures that indicate that a large number of Indians have tuberculosis.

Mr. HERNANDEZ, of New Mexico. I have in mind a small tribe of Indians where about 75 per cent of them, so they claim, have tuberculosis.

Mr. MERITT. That is probably the most flagrant condition existing in the Indian Service. You refer, of course, to the Jicarilla Reservation in New Mexico.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I don't know the reason for that. I was trading with them for several years, 20 years ago, and they were a healthy Indian * * *. What is the cause of that condition in that particular place?

Mr. MERITT. My impression is that a great many years ago those Indians lacked sufficient food, and they got into a weakened condition, and the disease to which they are most susceptible took hold, and we have never been able to eradicate it.

Thereafter, on page 771 of hearings:

Mr. HERNANDEZ. A sort of pessimism has taken hold of these Indians on account of their poor health, and then they have a reservation that is not susceptible of being cultivated very much. They have no water, but they do a little farming along some of the valleys.

SEVENTY-FIVE PER CENT OF ONE TRIBE WITH TUBERCULOSIS

From the foregoing it appears that 75 per cent of these 600 Apache Indians were sick with tuberculosis, and the bureau witness sought to lay responsibility to conditions a great many years ago.

(Page 1103)

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Is it a self-supporting agency?

Mr. SHIPLE. That agency can be made absolutely self-supporting.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. The only unfortunate circumstance in connection with that tribe of Indians is that they are all sick. We had better feed them up good and see how many we can save, because in the next 10 years I think they will disappear unless something is done.

To this no response was made by the bureau witness, but the philosophy of Hernandez, whom I met last fall in New Mexico, is 1,000 per cent better than that announced by the Indian Bureau that these Indians can be made self-supporting out of their small property holdings. "Feed them" is his first prescription. Keep them from starving. That is the humane thing to do.

May I also revert to statements made at two Indian reservations visited that a cut of 50 per cent in medical supplies by the Indian Bureau was charged to Coolidge economy rather than to bureau cheeseparing where the fault lies.

Again I quote from the report of General Blue, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, found in the Snyder report, not to fix responsibility upon the present bureau's administration but to ascertain facts on which to act intelligently.

An investigation into Indian health conditions was held in 1912; an extract from the report is as follows:

The field investigations were begun September 28, 1912, and terminated December 30, 1912, 14 officers being assigned to the work. Reservation and nonreservation boarding schools in 25 States were visited, and a total of 39,231 Indians examined, representing approximately one-eighth of the entire Indian population of the continental United States.

Attention was paid to sanitary conditions in schools and on reservations, with special relation to housing conditions, food supply, and social and personal habits tending to favor the spread of disease among the Indian population. As a result of the examination it became evident that trachoma and tuberculosis are veritable scourges of the Indian race.

Trachoma: Out of 39,231 Indians examined at all the reservations and nonreservation boarding schools visited, 8,940 individuals, or 22.7 per cent of the entire number were found to have trachoma. * * *

Trachoma was found to be generally prevalent in the schools to a greater degree than on the reservations from which the pupils are drawn, and in nonreservation boarding schools it was found that groups of pupils from the areas where trachoma is absent, or but slightly prevalent, presented a high percentage of infection. The inference was reasonable that these pupils contracted the disease at such nonreservation boarding schools.

JULY 14, 1926.

Tuberculosis: Although no accurate data could be obtained relative to the length of time tuberculosis has existed among the Indians, it was found that the disease is widespread among them.

Considerable variation was noted in the case incidence of the disease, the percentage of tuberculous Indians varying in the several States and on the different reservations in the same State. The more primitive the Indian, generally speaking, the higher the percentage of tuberculosis.

On the whole, it may be said that the prevalence of tuberculosis among the Indians is very greatly in excess of that among the white race, depending on locality and the survey, as conducted, has revealed a situation so serious as to require the prosecution of vigorous measures for its relief.

Thereafter General Blue was asked if he could state whether or not based on his survey that tuberculosis and trachoma was on the increase among the Indians, to which he responded both diseases were very prevalent, but he was not prepared to say as to the increase.

INDIAN DECREASE IN POPULATION THROUGH DISEASE

Indian Commissioner Leupp, speaking in 1910 of a decrease of Indian population, states that the best obtainable data are that between 800,000 and 900,000 Indians occupied the territory now known as the United States. In 1910 the Indian Office estimated roughly their number to be about 300,000, or a decrease of nearly two-thirds due to war, famine, disease, and other causes. However, he adds that the decrease among the full bloods is far greater, because so large a proportion of those legally classed as Indians are from one-half to seven-eighths white or less. He believed the increase in mixed bloods about set off the full bloods, but at the same time he stated the tribal census rolls have not undergone a revision for a long time and usually added births but ignored deaths as far as possible, because every addition to the family meant increased rations and annuities, while deaths meant a decrease.

No accurate census can be had of the Navajos or other widely scattered Indians, who are nomads and are liable to double registration or estimates where the system is necessarily crude. Congressman Cramton, of Michigan, has said as much during debate on this Interior Department Indian bill. He certainly is unprejudiced in making that statement.

California authorities claim the Indians in that State have decreased from 200,000 to about 20,000, or about 90 per cent decrease. Certainly the decrease in New York, my own State of Wisconsin, and other States has been in nearly the same proportion. Whether any increase in Arizona, Oklahoma, and other States has more than kept pace with losses in those States is largely a matter of speculation.

When the present Indian Commissioner or his deputy says the Indians, notwithstanding disease, starvation, and plagues, are increasing, it is proper to ask what amount of white blood makes an Indian; who takes the census and how and when, and also whether these figures which are paraded constantly in the press are more than guesses, with only guesses, in the past for comparison. Does his effort to show health improvement affect the facts? The cases of heavy mortality are vouched for; have the births kept pace?

THE PIMA INDIAN STARVATION CASE

Is the Pima's mortality five times as great as among the whites? This is asserted by those who claim to know the facts.

I have a copy of letter handed me in person, when in Phoenix, that takes my friend, Representative Cramton, to task for reflecting on the standing of Dr. Dirk Lay, a splendid missionary whom I have met repeatedly in Washington, and also out on the Pima Reservation, near Phoenix, last October. I can say personally that Doctor Rule, the letter writer, is a fine type of fearless manhood, in or out of the ministry. Everybody who spoke to me of him gave unrestricted praise for this minister, who, in the service as an Army chaplain, made a splendid record.

He defends Doctor Lay, the Pima Reservation missionary, without limit, and all this I insert in the letter excepting personal criticisms of my distinguished colleague, that are omitted.

Rev. Mr. Lay is an upstanding, broad-shouldered, muscular white missionary among the Pimas. After my visit to the Pima Reservation I am satisfied his statement of bad health conditions and of suffering among the Pimas is no exaggeration. Rev. Mr. Rule, familiar with the reservation, also expresses himself unreservedly. I would prefer their judgment and my own investigation to any gilded reports from the Indian Bureau. Any congressional investigating committee that will really investigate I predict must find conditions of neglect, and worse, as described by Doctor Rule and Doctor Lay. The letter follows:

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON, M. C.,

Lapeer, Mich.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMTON: I have been following the affairs at Washington with a new interest in the last few years, because either my friends Senators CAMERON, ASHURST, or Congressman HAYDEN have been sending me the records of proceedings affecting Arizona. I notice in "Extracts from hearings before Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations" under date of Thursday, May 13, 1926, that you are possessed of rare moral courage. Having had considerable military experience I know just what it takes to stand up before a company of those who know you under differing circumstances and say, "I myself am a Presbyterian." * * *

If you had taken the time to investigate, and I believe you owe it to yourself as well as those whose taxes pay your salary, that you should investigate, you could never have referred to Dr. Dirk Lay as a "so-called Presbyterian missionary operating among these Indians, and otherwise in Arizona." * * *

Doctor Lay is a Presbyterian missionary and not a "so-called" one, and anyone who throws suspicion on his good standing as a missionary by referring to him as a "so-called missionary" would appear to be actuated by motives other than Presbyterian and certainly not Christian.

I am chairman of the committee which has the directive oversight of Doctor Lay's field * * *. I am fully conversant with conditions on the Pima Indian Reservation from personal observation, and many of the claims of Mr. Meritt, especially the one thousand and odd permanent houses with wooden floors, seem to me like a bluff and Jeff column. I have been on the reservation within 10 days, too, and not about 10 years ago as you were.

Why did you not say it was 10 years since you were there? Further, I was in Syria and Palestine in 1917-1919, when Uncle Sam saved a million lives from death by starvation, and I know the evidences of starvation. The Pima Indians show, on the whole, the same symptoms of undernourishment over a period of years that the Syrians did, and they are just as likely to be decimated by some epidemic disease as the Syrians were. The only difference I can see is the Syrians' lifeblood was sucked by the despicable Turk, the Pimas suffer because of injustice and delay.

I am a Democrat, but before that a lover of truth and a follower of Him whose standard is "revile not." I hope you will not think I am reviling you as you do Doctor Lay, whose 14 years of missionary work in Arizona is an epic of self-sacrifice unmatched by most congressional records. In the future you may safely leave out any "so-called" before Doctor Lay's name, and as he is devoting his life to the Pimas, you may leave out your unfortunate "and otherwise." * * *

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR A. RULE,

Chairman Synod's Committee on National Missions.

The death rate among the Pimas has been reported to be about five times the mortality rate among the whites. That is an issue over which the Indian Bureau is concerned. Not as to the facts but publicity given to the facts. Mr. Meritt, above named, cuts medical supplies in half when the Washington office is doing cheeseparing but recommends a white-tourist bridge for the poverty-stricken Pimas at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars when the Pimas did not know of the Santa Claus act for which Mr. Meritt was charging them; and he did this act notwithstanding the undernourishment and high death rate charged to Indian Bureau neglect. The Pima death rate is notoriously high, and responsibility therefor rests at the doors of the Indian Bureau. That is the issue.

THE INDIAN BUREAU'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ZUNI INDIAN DEATHS

Out of a large amount of data that has come to my hands and cases which came under my own observation, I cite the Zunis, whom I visited last October.

For 10 years the largest Pueblo Indian tribe has been dying off with dysentery, typhoid, and other diseases caused by drinking water from shallow wells polluted by sewage from the Indian reservation and school buildings built by the Indian Bureau. This constant menace to life and the heavy sick and mortality rate has occurred directly from action of the Indian Bureau. Promises have been made for years, we were informed, of some attempt to relieve the situation, but for all the years down to the time we were there the Indian death rate and insanitary conditions due directly to bureau management still continued. The school and reservation sewage is carried down to the Indian village and could not fail to cause sickness and needless deaths. For this the bureau must be held responsible.

INDIAN MORTALITY DUE TO PRESENT OFFICIALS

I am informed the Federal census based on the Indian death registration in 14 States disclosed that the death rate has increased 48 per cent since Commissioner Burke took office in 1920 and during the time Mr. Meritt has aided him in protect-

ing the lives of the Indians. During that period the white death rate has averaged below 12 out of 1,000 every year while the Indian death rate per thousand has increased in 1921, 17.5; 1922, 19.2; 1923, 22.5; 1924, 25.9. I do not claim independent knowledge of the facts, but it is a matter that should be fully investigated by a competent congressional committee that will not depend on bureau agents for its conclusions.

The claim of the Indian Bureau that these statistics of the Federal Government are not correct is met by the statement that the Federal Government in such cases received its data from Indian Bureau agencies.

A thorough Indian Bureau investigation by a congressional committee will determine the degree of responsibility of the present bureau officials, but I am not concerned in fixing responsibility so much as I am in relieving the Indians on the Hopi, Navajo, Apache, and other reservations from neglect and needless suffering as evidenced by my own observations on the Zuni Reservation.

INDIAN HEALTH LEGISLATION PROPOSED—THEN ACCEPTED—THEN REJECTED
BY THE INDIAN BUREAU

The Indian Bureau will not brook any interference with its control of the property or person of the Government's Indian wards or with any offers of aid or cooperation by the States to improve Indian health conditions. Pity it is, it is so.

I have learned of recent proposals from the Secretary of the Interior, based on recommendations of committees having Indian welfare at heart, and in one case coming from a committee appointed by Secretary Work. He then recommended that legislation to that end be passed, according to my information, but the Indian Bureau has blocked any further efforts in that direction and reigns supreme with all its record of neglect as a curse on the Indians who are left. I am placing a brief summary of its record that again damns the responsible Indian Bureau for its stupidity or worse. The record, I believe, is substantially as here related.

Transfer to the United States Public Health Service was first recommended by the special committee of the House to investigate Indian affairs, Mr. Snyder, chairman:

That the medical service for Indians be transferred to the United States Public Health Service.

This recommendation was made in 1920, after an exhaustive investigation of Indian Bureau neglect.

This proposal was seconded by the Board of Indian Commissioners, who made a recommendation substantially identical in 1920; and this recommendation has never been reversed by that board.

The proposal was also seconded by the Association of United States Army Surgeons in 1922.

Again it was seconded by the Association of State and Provincial Health Officers in 1923.

The Committee of One Hundred, formed by Secretary Work, recommended:

We urge that every possible aid of State boards of health be enlisted in cooperation with the National Government in this health campaign.

The Committee of One Hundred did not recommend the transfer of Indian medical service to the Public Health Service. A resolution calling for this, I am advised, was smothered, because the Indian Bureau controlled a majority of Work's Committee of One Hundred. A resolution calling on the National Bureau of Municipal Research to reopen and carry forward its study of the business methods of the Indian Bureau was likewise smothered, according to report.

COOPERATION WITH THE STATES

I am advised Secretary Work repeatedly in reports and speeches has recommended that the responsibility for Indian education, social welfare, and health be transferred to the States. In accordance with his recommendations the States of California and Wisconsin introduced bills giving to these States jurisdiction over the Indians in these particulars alone and making available to these States under contract and under Federal supervision the moneys now being spent by the Indian Bureau on these services in these States. After a two months' delay, I am advised, the Secretary of the Interior gave an unequivocal written indorsement of these bills (the Johnson-Swing bill for California and the La Follette-Cooper bill for Wisconsin).

At the Senate Indian Affairs Committee hearing the Indian Bureau is reported to have manifested reluctance to have the bills reported. The matter then went over to the present session.

In San Francisco on December 1, 1926, Mr. Meritt announced in reply to questioning of the bureau's opposition to these bills and stated that he was authorized to speak for the bureau, hence presumptively for the Secretary of the Interior.

He stated that only the "principle" referred to in the bills had been indorsed by Secretary Work. Secretary Work had, however, sweepingly and specifically indorsed the bills, I am informed, before he was overruled by Mr. Meritt, the real head and fount of Indian bureaucracy in this Government.

That brings the record down to date. The bureau will not permit State action under practicable conditions, and it will not permit transfer to the United States Public Health, and it will not do the job itself in an adequate way. So says Mr. Meritt.

Meantime what of the States?

California in April, 1925, through its legislature voted \$100,000 for the relief of sick Indians in that State. The governor vetoed this appropriation, after a nearly unanimous vote by the legislature, on the ground that the State of California was without jurisdiction, because the Indians were exclusively a Federal responsibility. The Swing-Johnson bill, now opposed by the bureau, would rectify this situation and enable California to get into action decisively; California's readiness has been demonstrated to aid to the utmost in caring for the Indians within its borders.

Wisconsin in June, 1925, appropriated \$16,000 for medical service to the few Indians of that State.

The moment that the Swing-Johnson authorizing act is passed, and responsibility accepted by California (which would be immediately), there would become available for the education of each Indian child \$30 per annum from the State treasury, or more than \$100,000 a year.

In other words we can cooperate with the States in eradicating diseases of hogs, cattle, cotton, and other products. We can cooperate with highways and help for white citizens in countless ways, but not with our Indian citizenship.

Because why? Ask Mr. Meritt, who overrules Work and Burke and by so doing makes men retract their pledges to the Indians.

If the States disclose, as they surely would, that local care of Indians is vastly better than the Indian Bureau's record of neglect then other extensions of State supervision would follow, and soon Meritt's job would be gone. That is an explanation offered for the reverse action on Indian health by the bureau.

Commissioner Burke prepared a "substitute" wherein, after requiring the State to enact health legislation therein, provided he, Commissioner Burke, under the name of the Secretary of the Interior, may, "in his discretion," make whatever contract he sees fit. Congress, law, and its administration again are placed under the jurisdiction of the Indian Bureau. The substitute is one that means nothing except continued Indian Bureau control and was drawn for that purpose.

TEN-DOLLAR INDIAN COURTS

I have repeatedly set forth the illegal, unconstitutional, and autocratic \$10 per month Indian judge system whereby Indian agents by authority of law appoint some Indian to act in their stead to enforce the agent's will in Indian government. If a good despot, the Indian may get fair treatment, but unlimited power in any bureau from the head to the merest agent is dangerous, un-American, oppressive, and illegal. To-day, without authority of law, the Indian agent is despotic dictator in all cases of misdemeanor, real or imagined, with no written law and no court practice where the accused Indian-American citizen has any attorney to protect his rights, no jury to determine his guilt or innocence of any alleged offense, no right to bail nor appeal to any court. How many white men would submit to such rules and illegal judges? The subterfuge is so absurd and indefensible that the best argument against it is found in an attempted defense of the "bluff" system set forth by Leupp in explanation of the illegal practice. The bureau, excepting in eight Federal court felony cases, now refuses to permit the Indian to have a jury trial or trial by any qualified court.

The illegal \$10 Indian judge system ought to be shelved with other public myths affecting the supposed considerate and elevating treatment given by the Indian Bureau to its wards of to-day. Bills authorizing a practicable and just court procedure in all such cases were opposed by the bureau last session. Unless contaminated by evil white influences the average Indian is honest, well behaved, and a good citizen. This statement I found general among the Indians and white people wherever I went. The problem of Indian lawlessness is practically nothing compared with that of his white "brother." In 4,480 miles of travel, with clothing and many valuables left exposed, including money oftentimes, with the automobile left unwatched in Indian villages night and day, not an article was found missing at the end of our long journey. That speaks for the honesty of thousands of Indians whom we went to see. "Stick 'em

up" is a popular expression among certain whites found in our cities, while the tires and car could not safely be left unlocked on the streets of Washington overnight.

Mixed bloods and youths who have learned evil practices from whites are occasionally complained about, although from all I could learn the standard of law-abiding citizenship, however poor the Indian, is far above the average found in white communities similarly situated, according to many opinions expressed.

The Indian should be held amenable to law the same as every other citizen. He should also have the same rights in either State or Federal courts that his white brother has and be subject to the same laws. I introduced several bills on the subject giving the courts jurisdiction of the property and person of the Indian, but every bill so introduced that attempted to take from the Indian Bureau its exclusive right of absolute control of the property and person of the Indian was opposed by the bureau.

The fault that no law exists for the control of Indians by ordinary lawful methods is alone chargeable to the Indian Bureau's opposition. An investigation would speedily determine the reason for that opposition and which system is the best—legal court procedure or bureaucratic rule.

One is legal, with definite laws to be obeyed and simple defined rules of practice in courts that will protect the rights of a defendant and administrator of justice to the innocent or guilty the same as the white man enjoys.

The other now controls the Indian's person and property and leaves all legal rights, justice, trial procedure, sentencing, and execution of the sentence to an Indian agent possibly good, possibly bad, and often indifferent. For the protection of the Indian and protection of every right-minded agent a proper court procedure is the only right method, and constructive legislation urged by an unprejudiced committee of Congress would so provide.

ONE OF THE INDIAN BUREAU'S BALL-AND-CHAIN PUNISHMENTS

I have placed affidavits and other evidence in the RECORD showing present illegal Indian judge court practices. In my own State of Wisconsin I submit a telegram to the President from Governor Blaine, of Wisconsin, and affidavits, none of which have been controverted, yet the brutal Indian agent has been retained in the Indian Service.

Take the Wisconsin case. Governor Blaine, of Wisconsin, sent to President Coolidge the following telegram:

MADISON, Wis., February 15, 1926.

President CALVIN COOLIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Responsible woman, whose word I believe, reports that Paul Moore, an Indian, charged with a misdemeanor, was found on January 26 at Lac du Flambeau (Wis.) Agency jail, in a cell 6 by 8 feet, with clogged toilet, and with ball and chain fastened to ankle. In same jail were incarcerated Indian women. This condition is abhorrent to the dictates of decency and our vaunted civilization. This is the tyranny of the Dark Ages and the practice of the degenerate dominate to terrorize the Indian, who needs help more than a jail. In the name of humanity I beg that that sort of thing cease.

JOHN J. BLAINE, Governor.

This is not to excuse in any degree any offense, if an offense was committed, but to get some facts in a case where letters to Senator LA FOLLETTE heretofore inserted in the RECORD state that Moore was brought before Superintendent Hammitt of the agency; that an Indian named Sawgetchwayghezis, posing as a judge, was present, who could not read or write or talk English. He certainly would be forgiven for misspelling his own name. That Hammitt prepared and read Moore's sentence to six months' imprisonment in the agency jail. All this appears in the letter found in RECORD of March 4.

COMMISSIONER BURKE APPROVES BALL-AND-CHAIN USE BY HIS AGENTS

Assuming that all the facts were as claimed by Commissioner Burke, I submit his own statement (p. 27 of the hearings):

I say I have no sympathy for Paul Moore, and I think he ought to be in chains for not the time of the sentence of the Indian court but for a much longer period.

Commissioner Burke approves the ball-and-chain treatment, which is undenied, but he would have it continued for a much longer period than six months. No one knows just what his judgment would determine for ball-and-chain treatment, but that is his standard set for Indian agents throughout the country.

The commissioner approves ball-and-chain penalties and unlimited sentences by his agents who write the findings of the \$10-a-month courts. I offer brief extracts from affidavits set forth in full in speech of April 23, 1926. Additional data on the same case appears in speech of March 4 of last year.

THE LAC DU FLAMBEAU BALL-AND-CHAIN CASE

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

County of Ashland, ss:

Cecelia S. Rabideaux, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says: I am now 24 years of age and reside in the village of Odanah, within the Bad River Reservation, in Ashland County, Wis. On the 21st day of January, 1926, I was informed that my brother, Paul Moore, had been seized by the Indian police of said village, and, together with Maggie Crowe, who I asked to go with me, called on said police at the office of the Government farmer in said village and there asked to be advised as to what the warrant read for the arrest of Paul Moore. One Bawdee Marksman, who at times acts as a police, said, "It is not necessary that we have a warrant." I then asked, "How is that?" Bawdee Marksman then in substance further stated: "The Indian agent at Lac du Flambeau wrote to the Indian agent at Ashland, Mr. P. S. Everest, and that he in turn wrote to the Government farmer, Mr. A. L. Doan, who directed us to take Paul Moore the first time we saw him."

Paul Moore was put in jail at Odanah and there kept until the next morning, January 22, when he was taken to Lac du Flambeau, so then formed, by one Albert Snow, an Indian police for the Lac du Flambeau Reservation Agency. I asked Maggie Crowe to accompany me to Lac du Flambeau. We boarded the train therefor Tuesday morning, January 26, 1926, arriving at the said agency at 12 o'clock noon. We entered the agency office, and I introduced myself to the superintendent, Mr. Hammitt, with saying that I was Paul Moore's sister from Odanah and was there to see Paul, and also asked as to what he intended to do with him. He stated that he intended to keep him there, and that we would find him in the jail or in the dining room of the school, as he did not know where they would feed him. We then went out to the jail and there found Paul Moore in one of the cells therein, the size of which was about 6 by 8 feet. The same contained two bunks, and also in one corner thereof was a clogged toilet, from which came a stench that filled the room. Fastened to Paul Moore's ankle was a ball and chain.

In the same room, but outside of cells, were three men and a woman, all Indians, whose names we there learned were William Roy, Harry King, Charles Boneosh, and Mrs. Boneosh, who were all served with lunch soon after we were there by children of the school. I was informed by Mrs. Boneosh that, by reason of an arrest previous to the one for which they were then there, she and her husband were sentenced by Superintendent Hammitt to pay a fine of \$75 each; that that was all the money they had, and her husband handed it to said superintendent for her release, and he served time, along with several other prisoners, in work of repair about the said agency.

CECELIA S. RABIDEAUX.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of March, A. D. 1926.

O. A. PHARSON,

Notary Public, Ashland County, Wis.

(My commission expires September 2, 1928.)

Mrs. Rabideaux, I am informed, is chairman of the local League of Women Voters.

ANOTHER AFFIDAVIT ON THE WISCONSIN BALL-AND-CHAIN AGENCY

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

County of Ashland, ss:

Maggie Crowe, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says: I am of part Chippewa Indian blood, now 29 years of age, and reside in the village of Odanah, Wis.

I was on the 21st day of January, 1926, with Mrs. Cecelia S. Rabideaux when she called on the police of said village at the Government farmer's office in Odanah, and heard her ask to be informed as to what the warrant read for the arrest of Paul Moore. The police said that they had no warrant; that the Indian agent of Lac du Flambeau had written to the Indian agent at Ashland, Mr. P. S. Everest, and that he in turn had written to Mr. A. L. Doan, the farmer, who directed them, the police, to take Paul Moore as soon as they saw him.

Paul Moore was locked up on this 21st day of January in jail at Odanah, and on the following morning taken to the depot handcuffed and put onto the southbound 6.50 a. m. Northwestern train in charge of one Albert Snow, an Indian police from the Lac du Flambeau Indian Reservation.

I accompanied Mrs. Cecelia S. Rabideaux, January 26, 1926, to the Lac du Flambeau Indian Agency on a visit to her brother, Paul Moore, who we found in a cell within the agency jail. The air therein was very offensive, and on Mrs. Rabideaux's inquiry as to what smelled so, Paul Moore remarked that it was the toilet in the corner of the cell he was in, and showed us that it would not flush. This cell was about 6 by 8 feet and had two bunks therein, and to Mr. Moore's ankle was fastened a ball and chain. Outside of the cells in the same room were four other Indian prisoners, whose names we learned were William Roy, Harry King, Charles Boneosh, and Mrs. Boneosh. The woman told us that she and her husband had been, before this sentence for which they were now there, each fined \$75, that being all the money they had.

Her husband handed it to the said Lac du Flambeau Indian agent for her release, and he served time in labor about the agency premises, along with others, for which he got no pay.

MAGGIE CROWE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of March, A. D. 1926.

O. A. PEARSON,

Notary Public, Ashland County, Wis.

(My commission expires September 2, 1928.)

CONFISCATES CLOTHES AND LEAVES BALL-AND-CHAIN ORNAMENTS
STATE OF WISCONSIN,

County of Ashland, ss:

Mrs. Mary Moore, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says, I am a mixed-blood Chippewa Indian, now 46 years of age, residing in the village of Odanah, Wis., and the mother of 11 living children, 1 of them being Paul Moore, now 26 years of age.

On the 21st day of January, 1926, my son, Paul Moore, was arrested without warrant by the Indian police of this village and held in jail in said village until the following morning when he was delivered by them, handcuffed, at the depot of the Northwestern Railway to one Albert Snow, who, I was there told, was an Indian police of the Lac du Flambeau Indian Reservation, and who took with him aboard the south bound 6.50 train, Paul Moore.

I was informed by Paul Moore that he was first detained by the superintendent of the Lac du Flambeau Indian School and Agency in a jail at such agency, for five days after the 27th day of October last, and at which time he was made to take off his clothes, the same of which the superintendent of said agency took in charge and furnished old clothes for him to put on.

I am now indirectly advised that since the 22d day of January, 1926, the superintendent of the Lac du Flambeau School and Agency has sold Paul Moore's clothes, the same of which was an overcoat purchased in said October last at a cost of \$45 and a suit bought about a month before at a cost of \$35, together worth \$80.

MARY MOORE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of March, A. D. 1926.

C. A. PEARSON,

Notary Public, Ashland County, Wis.

(My commission expires September 2, 1928.)

THE INDIAN AGENT SELLS MOORE'S CLOTHES, WITH A BALL AND CHAIN
FOR SECURITY

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

County of Ashland, ss:

Charles La Casse, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says: I am now 20 years of age, and a member of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Chippewa Indians, on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation, in Vilas County of said State, where I have resided about all my life, except for the time of my attendance at the Tomah School, in this State, and at the Mount Pleasant School, in the State of Michigan, until the evening of January 22, 1926.

With the view of asking the superintendent in charge of the Lac du Flambeau Indian Agency, Mr. J. S. Hammitt, for an allowance out of my trust fund, though having been at a former request denied, I was at the said agency office to again make such a request through the so-called chief of police, a Mr. William Mattigosh, on the 22d day of January, 1926. While there and before Mr. Mattigosh could speak for me, he was given in charge of one Paul Moore, who he conducted to the jail of said agency. I followed him there and into the jail and saw Mr. Mattigosh place said Paul Moore in one of the cells therein and also saw him fasten a ball and chain to Paul Moore's ankle. Mr. Mattigosh then closed the door of the cell in which was the said Paul Moore, and locked it, as he did also the outer door of said jail after we had come out.

We then went into the agency office. I there heard the superintendent of the said agency say to the clerk thereof, a Mr. W. H. Shawnee, that they would sell Paul Moore's clothes. I was soon thereafter given a check on a bank of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., for \$15, and then asked by said superintendent to buy Paul Moore's clothes. This I declined to do; but I understand that they were sold to Mr. Mattigosh, who offered \$12 for them, an overcoat and a full suit, which I think from my examination of them must be worth at least \$40.

CHARLES LA CASSE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of March, A. D. 1926.

O. A. PEARSON,

Notary Public, Ashland County, Wis.

(My commission expires September 9, 1928.)

Four affidavits from responsible Indian witnesses have been submitted.

This is a case from my own State. I do not know whether Moore committed any offense, neither does Mr. Burke. Without attorney, jury, or right to any bail or court appeal, he was

kidnaped without papers and brought back 70 miles, where a ball and chain was placed on him while locked up in a foul-smelling cell. Then he "escaped," ball and chain and all excepting \$75 in good clothes sold by Hammitt, the agent. These facts seem undisputed; yet the most serious part of the whole outrageous travesty on justice is that Commissioner Burke approves such ball-and-chain treatment by his agents.

HAMMITT THE BALL-AND-CHAIN AGENT REMAINS IN CONTROL OF THE
INDIANS AT LAC DU FLAMBEAU AGENCY

To show the lawlessness of this brutal representative of Messrs. Burke and Meritt, I append a letter of recent date that in imperfect language but in plain terms discloses the unfeeling specimen of humanity who rules over these wards of the Government on that same (Lac du Flambeau) reservation. The letter speaks for itself:

SOPERTON, WISC., November 15, 1926.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I thought I would write to you to-day inform you about what the Agency done to me he took our children away from us as I told him I want them to attend Public school But he didnt mind me at all.

So he arrested me. Put me in Jail for not letting those children at Lac du Flambeau school (Indian school). So he came after them again after they lock me at Jail. So he send to Lac du Flambeau Indian school so the three Boys went to Lac du Flambeau. But only stayed one night after they got over there and came back home on account of they lost there young Brother so they went out to search for him. But they find him in the morning By white women. He must been on street about 10 o'clock in night so the women took boy at her Place so there is where they find him. So they came along with him. They all walked from Lac du Flambeau there shoes all torn to pieces all there stockings Torn off so when they got home they could hardly walk or get up.

So I was Put in Jail again for not letting those boys again. I stayed all together in Jail at Crandon Wis. 15 days. I ask him the Agency to let the boys attend this school where we live. But he said no I ain't going have no argument with you. He said to me Department say so to take all the Indian children to Lac du Flambeau. That is what I am going to do he said. They only have half day school. But that isn't good Public school was far off good for my children so Harry A. Dawson took my boys again. The oldest is near to six Grade.

I wish he could of attend this school here where they went to school last year. This school here was good for them. But I am sorry for them attending Government school. They know more than at government school and they eat hard crust bread at Lac du Flambeau. They say and the Agency didn't give any clothing to my children the first time he took them away. I just only wish to not have any more Government school or agency. I wish they won't be any of them so I let you know about this. To know what happened to us so you could tell about this matter so this be all for today hope we hear from your soon we all send

Best regards to you. Good Bye.

I remain,

WM. TAHWA.

Soperton, Wis.

MEXICAN OR INDIAN BUREAU'S ILLEGAL JAILING

This is not a case of Nicaraguan or Mexican jailing of Americans which, when reported, arouses every red-blooded 100 per cent American owner of an oil-well controlled press, and serves as another reason for American intervention abroad. No; this case is one of Hammitt, a lawless, brutal Indian agent who would be hanged as high as Haman for what he has done if he lived across the border in Mexico, Nicaragua, or Haiti. These countries would make such a sacrifice of a useless life rather than have more American marines landed on their shores to "preserve order" around American property.

The modern despotic Simon Lagree Hammitt is an Indian agent on a Wisconsin Indian reservation. He is strangely protected from State authorities' interference because of a twilight zone law that is construed to prevent State intervention within its own borders, and so Hammitt, an imitator of Meritt, locks up Indians with ball and chain for misdemeanors and now jails parents of Indian children because they prefer a white public school to one of Hammitt's choosing. No marines will be sent to the Lac du Flambeau Reservation in Wisconsin to put Hammitt in the same jail in which he imprisons the helpless wards of the Nation under his control, nor will any of the metropolitan papers engaged in chasing the native obstructors of American dollar investments in Mexico, Nicaragua, or Haiti find occasion to note acts of Hammitt, who only imitates the lawless course of his superiors in the Indian Bureau.

No "research" investigators appointed by Mr. Work would even bother with the ball-and-chain treatment of Moore or the jailing of an Indian father because he preferred a white American school for his children to one of Hammitt's choosing, but a

real congressional investigation would have Hammitt summarily kicked out of the service for incompetency and brutality, and a bureau that retained such an unfit employee in service for a year after his ball-and-chain exposure would be held accountable and receive the just condemnation of every right-thinking man. For that reason, however, Commissioner Burke objects to any congressional investigation, because it may be "partisan," but no other investigation will be of any value or give protection to the 225,000 American Indians now under control of the bureau.

Other instances of illegal ball-and-chain practices have been placed in the RECORD, disclosing that Commissioner Burke and his assistant, Meritt, are retaining such agencies in defiance of any law, and in violation of the plain dictates of humanity.

CUEL KIDNAPING TO FILL CONCENTRATION SCHOOLS

The Indian Bureau adopted years ago a policy of establishing great show places, schools in far western cities, where it was announced Indian children would be given higher education at what are termed nonreservation schools. Separating children from the tribe and tribal customs it was confidently predicted would alienate the children from their parents and start them on the high road toward a white man's civilization. Local schools in the villages and reservation boarding schools were still maintained wherever then established, but these local schools are now found not far enough removed from the Indian parents to suit Indian Bureau molders of a higher civilization.

A policy is therefore being carried out among tribes of the Southwest of taking practically all the Indian children from their parents on some of the reservations and sending them to concentration or nonreservation schools hundreds of miles away, where they can not see their parents for years at a time. In other words, it was told to me the Indian Bureau molders of a higher civilization will eventually abandon these Southwestern day schools and reservation boarding schools and ship all Indian children to the distant concentration schools.

Children as young as six years are now taken away from their parents and in the aggregate thousands of Indian children under existing law have been kidnaped and taken from their parents. Sometimes these children die far away from their people. I was given instances where a number of children had contracted tuberculosis at Phoenix and were returned to their reservation over 200 miles distant, there to die with their tribe. But the civilization by kidnaping, like former Christianizing of Indians by killing, goes on under the present Indian Bureau's management.

Proudly the bureau or local agent sometimes exhibits a document with thumb marks of parents to show that the kidnaping was not violent or forcible. I talked with Indians who had not seen their children for years, and with white persons who knew the facts at or near the reservation, and they said Indian agents carry out the bureau's orders without discretion. With consent forced by circumstances and sometimes without consent, a race in our midst that suffers ball-and-chain treatment when agents deem such treatment necessary is frightened into submission through fear of the agents and an autocratic powerful bureau at Washington.

Kidnaping is peaceful when parents helplessly submit, but forcible we were told when they refused.

Harriet Beecher Stowe aroused the hatred of the world against tearing children from negro parents and selling them to strangers under practices of slavery. But these negro children had grown to be of help, so that they were partially weaned from their parents.

To-day, Indian children, little and big, are taken far away to distant schools, and parents, with the same affectionate love that white people have for their children, are separated from their own by the Indian Bureau's civilizing policy.

Indians have few comforts and few of the privileges that are enjoyed by whites, but they have an Indian love as deep as the whites have for their own children. That small comfort to the Indian parents is taken away, often forcibly, and the picture of misery out on the reservation is one that can not be imagined or understood by the average white person.

Day schools, reservation boarding schools, and where available, as with the Crow Indians and others, white public schools should be made available for Indian children and the present inhuman policy restricted or abolished.

As well could we rightfully and humanely take the children of Meritt, Burke, or Secretary Work and separate them from their parents for three years or more. Such a proposition would meet forcible opposition, with deadly weapons if necessary. The Indian parent is locked up when he protests, even in my own State of Wisconsin where ball-and-chain treatment is popular with the bureau and with its agents, as I have just disclosed by affidavits and correspondence.

I repeat the statement made at the outset of these remarks; inhuman treatment of American Indians is worse than ever before.

One hundred questions asked by prominent Western people of Assistant Commissioner Meritt are contained in my remarks of December 13. These questions affecting the Indian Bureau's mistreatment of Indians were unanswered, but form the basis of serious charges that in themselves should be investigated.

A CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

Based in part on my own personal observations among many western Indian tribes, I have offered these views with a firm belief that the dark blot on American history caused by our unjust treatment of the Indians may be wiped out for all time by a constructive legislative program.

Suggestions have been offered by various agencies that have studied the Indian problem and that recognize bureaucratic straitjackets worn by the Indians for nearly three-quarters of a century are to the everlasting discredit of a country that has opened its doors and welcomed the oppressed of every land to enjoy American citizenship on an equality with the native born.

We have given to the only real Americans full rights of citizenship with a genealogy traced back to the everlasting mountains and cliffs wherein their forefathers lived, yet these American citizens are now treated by their white brothers as "incompetents" and culprits requiring an iron-handed strait-jacket control by hard-shelled bureaucrats.

Not one argument can be offered for the maintenance of this cold-blooded Indian Bureau treatment that savors of Spanish Inquisition methods, as unwarranted and unforgivable as Nero's reign in Rome.

Facts have been given that can not be covered up by evasion or excuses and that everlastingly damn the present system. It remains for Congress and Congress alone to meet the Indian problem squarely and wipe from the slate over a century's record of injustice, neglect, and ill treatment of these helpless wards of our Government. Only a congressional investigation committee can adequately diagnose the existing disease and prescribe a constructive remedy that will be adopted by Congress. When that is done the great mass of those who have been kept under the iron heel of the Indian Bureau system will then rise up and call you blessed.

INDORSEMENT OF MR. UNDERHILL'S ADDRESS

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has just addressed the House. I have been looking for that speech and have wanted it for a long time. I indorse everything he has said, and I know the Members of the House indorse what he has said. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President did on the following dates approve and sign bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 15, 1926:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution relieving posts or camps of organizations composed of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines from liability on account of loss or destruction of obsolete rifles loaned by the War Department;

H. R. 9232. An act for the relief of Isaac A. Chandler; and

H. R. 11662. An act authorizing an expenditure of tribal funds of the Crow Indians of Montana to employ counsel to represent them in their claims against the United States.

On December 16, 1926:

H. R. 3278. An act for the relief of A. S. Rosenthal Co.;

H. R. 7930. An act for the relief of the Broad Brook Bank & Trust Co.; and

H. R. 12393. An act to amend paragraphs 1 and 2 of section 26 of the act of June 30, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920."

On December 18, 1926:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1926, on the 20th day of that month.

On December 21, 1926:

H. R. 12853. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to turn over the gunboat *Wolverine* to the municipality of Erie, Pa.

On December 23, 1926:

H. R. 13504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926.

On December 29, 1926:

H. R. 12316. An act to amend the Panama Canal act and other laws applicable to the Canal Zone, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, which was signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10929. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Thorntown Township, Cook County, Ill.

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, on the authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 13070, a bill granting the consent of Congress to Henry L. Gray and Elbert M. Chandler, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Washington, and which bill has been reported to the House and is on the Consent Calendar, may be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota, by authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, asks unanimous consent to rerefer a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the situation of this bill at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the calendar, as the Chair is informed, and the committee desire the bill rereferred to the committee. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 14827 and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what bill is this, may I ask?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Interior Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Following is the conference report and accompanying statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$107,000, of which \$42,500 shall be for the Bureau of Education"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "heretofore paid for the said governor and said chief and \$2,000 for the said mining trustee"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For fees and mileage of examining surgeons engaged in the examination of pensioners, for services rendered within the fiscal years 1927 and 1928, \$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$25,000, of which \$600 shall be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendment numbered 37.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
FRANK MURPHY,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

Managers on the part of the House.

REED SMOOT,
CHARLES CURTIS,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Interior Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 1: Appropriates \$366,600 for salaries under the office of the Secretary, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$360,000 as proposed by the House.

On No. 2, relating to printing and binding for the department: Appropriates \$107,000, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$114,000, as proposed by the Senate, and makes \$42,500 of the sum available for the Bureau of Education.

On No. 3: Restores the House language, stricken out by the Senate, which provides that none of the appropriation of \$800,000 for surveying public lands shall be available for expenditure in any State which under the act of August 18, 1894 (28 Stat. p. 395), advances money to the United States for such purposes.

On No. 4: Accepts the House language providing for report of certain diversions of appropriations in the annual Budget.

On No. 5: Corrects a typographical error.

On No. 6: Appropriates \$3,210,000 for nonreservation boarding schools, instead of \$3,228,500 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,185,000 as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriates \$60,000 for the construction of the Yakima Sanatorium for treatment of tubercular Indians, as proposed by the House.

On No. 9: Appropriates \$900,000 for general support and civilization of Indians, instead of \$925,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$870,000 as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 10, 11, and 12: Appropriates \$40,000 of tribal funds for support and civilization of Flathead Indians, as proposed by the House, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16: Provide one mining trustee to serve jointly the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, as proposed by the House, instead of one trustee for each nation, as proposed by the Senate; provide a salary of \$2,000 for such trustee, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the House; and provide a salary of \$3,000, as heretofore, for the governor of the Choctaw Nation, instead of \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 17: Appropriates \$1,160,000 for salary roll for the Bureau of Pensions, instead of \$1,190,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$1,132,460, as proposed by the House.

On No. 18: Appropriates \$130,000 for travel expenses, Bureau of Pensions, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 19: Appropriates \$450,000 for fees and mileage of examining surgeons, Bureau of Pensions, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$400,000, as proposed by the House, and accepts the Senate language.

On Nos. 20 and 21: Accept the Senate language specifically mentioning salary of Commissioner of Reclamation.

On Nos. 22, 23, and 24: Appropriates \$23,000 for office expenses, Bureau of Reclamation, in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, and make a separate and additional appropriation of \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate, for attendance at conventions, instead of including that amount for that purpose in the appropriation for such office expenses, as proposed by the House.

On No. 25: Appropriates \$25,000 for office expenses of the chief engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 26: Appropriates \$50,000 for personal services, field legal offices, Bureau of Reclamation, instead of \$48,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 27: Appropriates \$20,000 for printing, binding, etc., Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the House, instead of \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 28: Reappropriates unexpended balance for Yuma auxiliary project, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 29: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for survey and examination of water-storage reservoir sites on the headwaters of the Truckee River.

On No. 30: Accepts Senate language concerning Utah Lake control on the Salt Lake Basin project.

On No. 31: Corrects total.

On No. 32: Appropriates \$25,000 for national monuments, instead of \$23,230, as proposed by the House, and \$25,030, as proposed by the Senate, and makes \$600 of the sum immediately available.

On No. 33: Appropriates \$2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,500,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of roads in national parks.

On No. 34: Accepts Senate language as to traveling expenses of employees transferred from one post of duty to another in the National Park Service.

On No. 35: Limits to use for capital expenditures \$400,000 of the appropriation for the Alaska Railroad, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 36: Corrects clerical error.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendment of the Senate:

On No. 37: Howard University.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
FRANK MURPHY,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement which accompanied the report and which has been read, sets forth very definitely and fully the changes in the bill and the results of the conference. Due to the fact that the Navy appropriation bill is to follow, it is not my desire to stand in the way of the progress of that important measure. I do not plan to take any special amount of time now in discussing the report. Of course, I will desire to answer any questions that may be asked with reference to it.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I would like to inquire as to the change in reference to the mining trustees. I notice the Senate cut out one of them.

Mr. CRAMTON. You mean of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nation?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the measure passed the House it was in the form that it has held for several years. It provided that the governor of the Chickasaw Nation and the chief of the Choctaw Nation and one mining trustee for the two nations should receive the salaries heretofore paid them. That salary was \$3,000 for the governor, \$2,000 for the chief, and \$4,000 for the mining trustee. In the Senate an amendment was adopted that provided for two trustees, one for each tribe, each to be paid \$2,000. I should have stated that the \$4,000 heretofore paid had been divided, \$3,000 by the Choctaws and \$1,000 by the Chickasaws. As a matter of fact, the position is not a very arduous one, and even with one man on the job it was very easy money. The Senate amendment not only provided for two instead of one, but provided for a salary of \$2,000 for each. While this would have provided two jobs where there has been one before, it would have increased the burden \$1,000 on one tribe and decreased the burden \$1,000 on the other tribe. Furthermore, I think unintentionally, but nevertheless effectually, the Senate amendment would have decreased the salary of the governor of the Choctaws from \$3,000 to \$2,000, which the conferees understood was not desirable.

The conference report leaves the governor's salary and the salary of the chief undisturbed, leaves one mining trustee to serve the two nations, but pays that trustee only \$2,000 instead of \$4,000, as heretofore, or \$2,000 each, as was proposed by the Senate for each one.

Mr. McKEOWN. The only difference, then, is there will be one less trustee?

Mr. CRAMTON. As compared with existing arrangements, it is the same except there is a \$2,000 salary instead of \$4,000, and it relieves the Indians' funds to that extent. The following is the statement given me by the Bureau of Indian Affairs concerning this:

AMENDMENTS 13, 14, 15, AND 16

The above-mentioned amendments provide in lieu of a mining trustee for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations a mining trustee for the Choctaw Nation and a mining trustee for the Chickasaw Nation and fixes their salaries at \$2,000 each. There are at present 60,000 acres of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations leased for coal and asphalt mining purposes. In the agreement of the United States with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma set forth in section 29 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1898 (30 Stat. L. 495-505-510), it was provided, relative to the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal coal and asphalt lands, that such coal and asphalt mines as were then in operation and all others which might thereafter be leased and operated, should be under the supervision and control "of two trustees, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, one on the recommendation of the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation, who shall be a Choctaw by blood, whose term shall be for four years, and one on the recommendation of the governor of the Chickasaw Nation, who shall be a Chickasaw by blood, whose term shall be for two years; after which the term of appointees shall be four years." It was further provided that "their salaries shall be fixed and paid by their respective nations."

The above-mentioned law, providing for two trustees, was modified by the act of Congress approved June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 398), which act reduced the number of coal and asphalt mine trustees to one.

Mr. Robert E. Lee, a Choctaw Indian by blood, of Idabel, Okla., was appointed by the President on April 19, 1926, to be the coal and asphalt mine trustee for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma for a term of four years at a salary of \$4,000 per annum, to be paid three-fourths from the funds of the Choctaw Nation and one-fourth from the funds of the Chickasaw Nation. The segregated coal and asphalt land is principally within the Choctaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation owns a three-fourths interest therein and the Chickasaw Nation a one-fourth interest therein. The effect of amendments 13, 14, 15, and 16 will be to restore the number of mining trustees for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations to that provided for in the above-mentioned agreement of the United States with those tribes, reducing, however, their salaries from \$4,000 per annum to \$2,000 per annum.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I notice this increases the salaries in the office of the Secretary from \$360,000 to \$366,600.

Mr. CRAMTON. There were some transfers involved in the salary roll of the office of the Secretary. The transfer of 22 employees from the office of pensions to the salary roll of the Secretary's office the House approved, and corrected the figures accordingly in each case. Certain proposed transfers from the Park Service and the Indian Service to the salary roll of the Secretary's office the House did not approve, so the total Budget figure requires some adjustment.

Mr. SNELL. Then it is simply a transfer?

Mr. CRAMTON. No. The Budget figure for the salary roll of the Secretary's office, these transfers being eliminated, was \$366,600. There had been some rather loose talk about eliminating some positions in the Secretary's office which our committee took seriously, and attempted to reduce the roll to \$360,000, but the office of Secretary protested, and the Senate went back to the Budget figure and the conferees accepted the Budget figure which is for the existing roll of the office.

Mr. SNELL. So we did not make any reductions whatever?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; not in the Secretary's office.

Mr. SNELL. I would also like to ask the gentleman about the appropriation for roads and trails in public parks.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the most important change made in the bill by the Senate. The Senate have added \$500,000 to the amount recommended by the Budget and the amount approved by the House, and the conferees have approved that action. That increase, however, is perhaps more apparent than real, by reason of the fact that the House action taken with reference to the authorization to contract, increasing that authorization from \$1,500,000 to \$2,500,000, was an expression of policy by the House, and our committee had fully expected that would be followed by a supplemental estimate from the Budget in the amount of one-half million dollars. We had not been told that would be done, but we had reason to think it would be done.

Mr. SNELL. And this is no more than you really had expected eventually to appropriate?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. The Senate proceeded without waiting for that estimate to come in.

Mr. SNELL. I knew this was different from what we had in mind originally when this bill was passed.

Mr. CRAMTON. I should say that the bill as now determined upon in conference, with the exception of the Howard University item—

Mr. SNELL. We expected that, anyway.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Howard University item is not acted on yet, but eliminating that, the present bill is \$732,910 above the House bill, \$500,000 of that being due to the item for park roads, and \$50,530 below the Senate figure. It would have been more below the Senate figure—there were more cuts made than that—but there was \$80,000 of cuts made in the House bill in the Senate which were restored in conference.

One of the two items was \$60,000 for the Yakima Sanatorium for the treatment of tubercular Indians, a very desirable item which was recommended by the Budget and put in by the House, but which the Senate had eliminated. On this the Senate receded. The following statement, given me by the Bureau of Indian Affairs concerning this, will be of interest:

AMENDMENT 3

The proposed sanatorium at Yakima, Wash., for which \$60,000 is requested, is for the benefit of cases of tuberculosis among approximately 18,000 Indians of the extreme Northwest. The nearest sanatoria provided at this time are at Fort Lapwai, Idaho, Pyramid Lake, Nev., with a small agency sanatorium at Miles, Wash., near Spokane, which serves the Colville agency specifically. The institutions referred to invariably run to capacity, and there is great need for the establishment of a sanatorium for the treatment of this disease at this point.

Among the white population generally throughout the country, sufferers from advanced cases of tuberculosis object greatly to going long distances from home to receive sanatorium treatment. Under such conditions extreme homesickness, as a rule, affects such patients and militates greatly against the arrest of the disease or the recovery of such patients. The Indians, to a greater degree than white people, object to being hospitalized, particularly for long periods of time, at long distances from their homes. The incidence of tuberculosis is very high in this section of the country and the segregation and care of cases of this disease will aid materially in preventing its spreading among younger Indians and children, and particularly where sanitary conditions in the average Indian home are favorable to its propagation.

A tuberculosis sanatorium at Yakima will fill a long-felt need and the Indians will respond readily to being hospitalized, in view of the fact that it will not take them to a great distance from home. There

are no hospital facilities at Yakima at the present time, and there are in excess of 3,000 Indians on that reservation who will benefit directly from such a sanatorium.

Due to lack of facilities for the hospitalization of this type of case in that general vicinity, it has been thought that the plant now existing at Yakima would provide the greatest amount of facilities for the expenditure involved than any other proposition. Some of the present buildings are in poor condition, others, notably the girls' dormitory, with a capacity of 67; the boys' dormitory, with a capacity of 64; employees' club, etc., are reported as in good condition and capable of being reconditioned for use as a tuberculosis sanatorium at a cost not in excess of the facilities to be provided. The location is believed to be very desirable, being situated at the foot of the mountains and the buildings located in a grove of large oak trees. The climate is mild and dry, with plenty of sunshine. Fort Simcoe is centrally located with respect to the Indian population of the Pacific Northwest, and reports indicate that it is the most feasible location now available for use as a tuberculosis sanatorium for that part of the country.

The expensive items in connection with its rehabilitation have largely to do with providing an adequate water supply and heating and lighting systems, the estimates for which are approximately \$14,000 for a water system, \$5,000 for an electric-lighting system, \$2,500 for the heating system for one building, the balance of the sum asked for to be used in the rehabilitation of the dormitory buildings, employees' club, equipment, etc. This plant would be capable of expansion once the water, lighting, and heating systems are established, at a reduced cost. The drainage is good and the present sewer system is good and in working order.

There is sufficient good land near the present site for vegetable gardens for early vegetables, as well as an 80-acre tract which could be utilized as a dairy and poultry farm, which would operate to materially reduce the operation costs of such an institution.

Individuals and organizations having the interests of the northwest Indians at heart are frequently calling the attention of this bureau to the urgent need of a tuberculosis sanatorium in this territory to combat the spread of this dread disease, which, as stated above, is very prevalent in this section of the country.

"Fort Simcoe" is the name of the Indian school which was formerly operated at this plant.

The Senate had further reduced the amount of the tribal funds to be used for administrative and other purposes of the Flathead Indian Reservation from forty to twenty thousand dollars, and the Senate receded. The Bureau of Indian Affairs advised me as follows concerning this amendment:

FLATHEAD TRIBAL FUNDS

The Indians of this reservation number approximately 2,726. On June 30, 1926, they had about \$158,494 in the United States Treasury derived from tribal timber sales. The agency is almost entirely supported from such funds. The appropriation therefrom for the fiscal year 1927 is \$40,000, and this amount was allowed by the Budget and the House for 1928, but the Senate reduced the item to \$20,000.

The net salary list chargeable to this fund is \$18,260, while \$9,500 will be required for annual estimate supplies, including rations for old Indians, hospitalization of indigents, fuel, and forage. Travel expenses of the superintendent and employees will absorb approximately \$1,500; freight, \$1,000; repairs and alterations, \$2,500; equipment, \$1,500; and unforeseen expenditures, the balance of the \$40,000 requested and allowed by the House. (See The Budget, 1928, p. 568.)

This item covers only absolute necessities for the proper and efficient conduct of our current activities at Flathead; and if only \$20,000 is appropriated, we will have to curtail the work there about 50 per cent, as the \$20,000 is little more than enough for the salaries of regular employees chargeable thereto, which leaves practically nothing for annual-estimate supplies, rations for old Indians, medical and hospital purposes, and the other expenses necessarily incident to the operation of an agency of this size and which looks after nearly 3,000 Indians. Such a sudden and drastic reduction in the customary activities at Flathead as will follow a 50 per cent cut in the appropriation will probably result in considerable hardship among the Indians. Particularly is this true as to rations for old Indians and the hospitalization of indigents, for which latter purpose the superintendent's budget authority for the current fiscal year carries an item of \$2,000, as we have no Government Indian hospital at Flathead, which makes it necessary to utilize outside facilities of this nature.

In addition to that, the bill as it now stands, if the conference report is adopted, will be approximately half a million dollars below the Budget figures. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. In connection with that I will put in a tabulation which shows the effect of the changes made in con-

ference to the various items. It should be stated that the bill was accepted very largely by the Senate as passed by the House, having made only 37 amendments in a bill of 99 pages, those 37 amendments including corrections of totals and typographical and clerical errors. The table follows:

Statement of Senate amendments involving appropriations, showing effect of action of conferees thereon

Amendment No.	Subject	Budget	Amount appropriated by House	Amount appropriated by Senate	Agreed amount	Increase (+) or decrease (-) agreed amount compared with House figure		Increase (+) or decrease (-) agreed amount compared with Senate figure	
						Reclamation fund	General	Indian tribal funds	General
1	Salary roll, office of Secretary.....	\$366,600	\$366,000	\$366,600	\$366,600		+\$6,600		
2	Printing and binding.....	114,000	100,000	114,000	107,000		+7,000		-\$7,000
6	Indian boarding schools.....	3,185,000	3,185,000	3,228,000	3,210,000		+25,000		-18,500
7, 8	Yakima Sanatorium.....	60,000	60,000		60,000				+60,000
9	Indians, general support and civilization.....	\$225,000	\$70,000	\$225,000	\$900,000		+30,000		-25,000
10, 11, 12	Flathead Indians, general support and civilization.....	40,000	40,000	20,000	40,000			+\$20,000	
17	Salaries, Pension Bureau.....	1,290,000	1,132,400	1,190,000	1,160,000		+27,540		-30,000
18	Travel expenses, Bureau of Pensions.....	130,000	100,000	130,000	130,000		+30,000		
19	Fees, examining surgeons, Bureau of Pensions.....	500,000	450,000	500,000	450,000		+50,000		-50,000
22, 23, 24	Expenses, Bureau of Reclamation in District of Columbia.....	(0)	20,000	25,000	25,000	+\$5,000			
25	Expenses, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver office.....	(0)	20,000	25,000	25,000				
26	Personal services, Bureau of Reclamation, field legal offices.....	(0)	48,000	50,000	50,000				
27	Printing and binding, Reclamation Bureau.....	(0)	20,000	30,000	20,000				
29	Truckee River survey.....			50,000	50,000	+50,000			
32	National monuments.....	23,230	23,230	25,030	25,000		+1,770		-30
33	National park roads.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		+500,000		
Total, increase or decrease.....						+55,000	+677,910	+20,000	-70,530

¹ Exclusive of certain proposed transfers not approved by committee.
² Including salary roll under "General expense" item.

³ Items were not segregated.
⁴ Limitations only, which do not affect total of the bill.

Total, all funds above House figure, \$732,910.
 Total, all funds below Senate figure, \$50,530.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. COLTON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the amount appropriated here will enable the department to carry on its program of road building in the parks without a supplemental appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. We do not anticipate a supplemental estimate for 1927 and 1928. My own feeling is, and it is the feeling of our committee, that a proper program in the future would involve an appropriation of two and a half million dollars a year, with authority to contract for a million and a half in addition. So that the cash available would be larger than the authority to contract instead of the present situation, where the authority to contract is larger than the appropriation.

Mr. COLTON. I agree with the gentleman, and that is my reason for asking the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will be interested to know that this increase makes possible a very early beginning of one of the most important scenic highways in America, the Mount Carmel Road in Zion National Park, and also the building of the south and west road in Mount Rainier Park.

Amendment 29, added by the Senate and accepted by the House conferees, is the same amendment as was offered in the House by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARNTZ] when the bill was under consideration here. There was not then opportunity for full consideration of it and no expression from the department. In view of the following letter from the department the House conferees accepted the amendment:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
 Washington, December 27, 1926.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
 House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: In response to your request over the telephone concerning the department's attitude with regard to the item of \$50,000 proposed to be included in the appropriation act for the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1928 for investigations on the Truckee River in California and Nevada, the following statement is submitted:

The construction of the Spanish Springs reservoir has been indefinitely postponed chiefly because of insufficient water supply. The extremely low run-off during 1924 and 1925 has served to emphasize the shortage and to indicate that the construction of a reservoir of this capacity and cost is not justified. The construction of a small reservoir at this point is not feasible because of excessive cost.

There is, and for some years has been, a shortage of water supply for the lands tributary to the Truckee Canal located on what are known as the Fernley and Swingle benches. There are about 7,200 acres of land under this canal now under water right and other areas tributary to the canal for which water rights have not been sold. These areas are within the limits of the Truckee division of the New-

lands project. One of the main functions of the proposed Spanish Springs reservoir was to furnish the additional water supply necessary for the Truckee Canal lands.

The landowners in the Truckee Meadows near Reno have expressed a desire to secure additional stored water, and the present plan now is to investigate the possibility of constructing one or more small reservoirs on the upper reaches of the Truckee River to furnish water for the Truckee Meadows lands and for those under the Truckee Canal. It is possible that by this arrangement cheaper storage may be provided for the Truckee lands and at the same time allay some of the opposition which has heretofore developed on the part of the Truckee Meadows people to the construction of the Spanish Springs reservoir.

Doctor Mead, of the Bureau of Reclamation, estimates that \$50,000 should be sufficient to make full investigation and report and recommends appropriation of this amount for the purpose stated. The department concurs in this recommendation.

Very truly yours,

E. C. FINNEY, Acting Secretary.

While I have the floor I should like to call to the attention of the House recent desirable developments in connection with water transportation to Alaska. Certain language was inserted in the item for the Alaska Railroad by our committee intended to make it possible for the Alaska Railroad management to deal with the need for increased water-transportation connection.

Since the bill passed the House I have had this word under date of December 23, 1926, from Noel W. Smith, general manager of the Alaska Railroad:

You may be interested in knowing that I have just received word from the Alaska Steamship Co. that they have been advised by the Pacific Steamship Co. that that company will start a weekly steamship service between Seattle and Seward commencing about April 1. Prior to this time the Pacific Steamship Co. has had service every two weeks.

The Alaska Steamship Co. advise that they have purchased a new steamship of somewhat the same type as their present *Yukon*, which is larger than the *Northwestern*. This new boat will be put in service instead of the *Northwestern* and will slightly increase their passenger-carrying capacity. It will also allow them to use the *Northwestern* for special excursions if any can be worked up.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, there is one amendment not being authorized by existing law that the conferees did not agree upon and is brought back for a separate vote. That is amendment 37.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries: For payment in full or in part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, the balance to be paid from privately contributed funds, \$150,000, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction.

General expenses: For equipment, supplies, apparatus, furniture, cases and shelving, stationery, ice, repairs to buildings and grounds, and for other necessary expenses, including \$17,600 for payment to Freedmen's Hospital for heat and light, \$68,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment thereto, as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"HOWARD UNIVERSITY

"Salaries: For payment in full or in part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, the balance to be paid from privately contributed funds, \$150,000, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction.

"General expenses: For equipment, supplies, apparatus, furniture, cases and shelving, stationery, ice, repairs to buildings and grounds, and for other necessary expenses, including \$17,600 for payment to Freedmen's Hospital for heat and light, \$68,000.

"For the construction of one additional dormitory building for young women, \$150,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I should explain that the amendment which I have offered is the same as the Senate amendment except that, in addition to the items restored by the Senate, my proposal restores also the \$150,000 for the girls' dormitory. In other words, the amendment which I have offered is exactly the language of the Budget, is exactly as were these provisions in the bill as reported to the House by the committee, but adds \$150,000 for constructing a girls' dormitory beyond what the Senate provisions took care of.

Now, if there is no request for time to discuss this amendment, I move the previous question on the amendment and all amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur with an amendment. The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CRAMTON, a motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

Mr. CRAMTON. Under leave given to extend my remarks I insert the following table comparing appropriations for the Interior Department, year by year, 1916 to 1928, inclusive, segregating as to appropriations from the tribal funds for benefit of the Indians, from the Federal Treasury for the Indians, but reimbursable, gratuity appropriations for the Indians, appropriations for payment of Army and Navy pensions, appropriations from the reclamation fund, all other appropriations, and the totals. The figures here given for 1928 include the appropriation for Howard University just approved by the House. The table follows:

Annual appropriations under the Department of the Interior, including deficiencies, fiscal years 1916-1928
[Exclusive of permanent and indefinite appropriations]

	Indian tribal funds	Indian reimbursable appropriations	All other Indian appropriations	Army and Navy pensions	Reclamation	All other Interior appropriations	Total
1928	\$2,301,800.00	\$2,002,125.00	\$9,286,810.00	\$221,000,000.00	\$11,793,800.00	\$16,167,285.00	\$262,551,820.00
1927 ¹	2,354,520.00	2,412,500.00	10,488,660.00	193,000,000.00	7,556,000.00	13,866,258.00	229,669,938.00
1926 ²	2,135,010.00	1,589,178.00	13,720,303.55	197,000,000.00	12,349,000.00	20,924,109.00	247,717,600.55
1925	2,612,700.00	1,555,600.00	9,656,420.00	222,500,000.00	11,106,289.00	19,215,518.00	266,736,527.00
1924	2,406,600.00	2,179,850.00	9,458,854.00	253,000,000.00	12,250,000.00	21,598,534.00	300,896,838.00
1923	2,483,573.00	1,041,466.00	9,383,720.00	268,000,000.00	15,075,000.00	22,710,520.00	318,694,279.00
1922	2,716,921.00	1,249,005.00	8,724,170.00	265,000,000.00	20,266,000.00	20,160,758.00	318,116,854.00
1921	1,415,165.00	1,450,830.00	9,268,513.00	279,000,000.00	8,463,000.00	21,972,532.00	321,570,040.00
1920	1,531,817.00	2,173,833.00	9,160,629.00	215,000,000.00	7,300,000.00	24,071,669.00	259,237,948.00
1919	1,750,000.00	2,133,583.00	8,982,753.00	223,000,000.00	9,497,080.00	20,365,644.00	265,729,060.00
1918	1,291,117.00	2,029,500.00	9,818,295.00	183,000,000.00	8,227,000.00	28,396,245.00	232,762,157.00
1917	1,263,250.00	1,921,986.00	9,045,658.00	163,000,000.00	8,884,000.00	18,275,465.00	202,390,359.00
1916	665,000.00	518,740.00	9,253,162.00	164,000,000.00	13,530,000.00	15,120,077.00	203,086,979.00

¹ Does not include appropriations for the Patent Office and the Bureau of Mines, which have been transferred to the Department of Commerce.

² Anticipated deficiency for 1927, due to increased rates effective Aug. 4, 1926, Civil War and Spanish American War pensioners, is expected to add \$41,000,000 to this amount.

³ Includes \$4,773,160 appropriated for the Patent Office and the Bureau of Mines transferred to the Department of Commerce July 1, 1925.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask to have an understanding in the matter of the control of the time for general debate. So far as the time itself is concerned, there has been considerable demand, and probably the entire day will be consumed in general debate. Because of that fact, I suggest that we defer fixing the time for closing general debate until later on in the afternoon.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I have had several requests for time on this side, and I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Idaho is a wise one.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the division of time, but am making the reservation for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman whether he knows when this formidable document containing the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in charge of the Navy Department appropriation bill for 1928, consisting of some eight hundred and odd pages, was ready for distribution to Members of the House?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, it was ready for distribution yesterday when this bill was reported.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How long does the distinguished gentleman from Idaho think it would take the average Member of the House to read the 800 pages of printed matter contained in this document, the answers and the questions and the tables and the statements of admirals and others, with relation to the Navy, its condition and its needs? What would be a reasonable time for the reading of the 800-page document which is filled with information upon matters that are vital to every Member of the House?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, it would take a considerable time to read the report, and it would take a considerable time to study the report. The hearings are intended to be rather encyclopedic, furnishing information on many particular subjects in which a Member might be interested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I was myself anxious to look at a little item in connection with the Naval Academy, and upon examining the report of the hearings, a copy of which I was unable to procure until to-day, I find that the Naval Academy matters are touched on in the hearing in not less than 15 different places, ranging all the way from page 86 to away up to page 285. It will be quite a little task to go through this document and try to dig out what I want to learn in regard to the Naval Academy, a matter that is not likely to be touched upon in general debate at all.

Mr. FRENCH. Generally speaking, may I say that the committee follows the policy of organizing the subject and of outlining it, and on the whole I think the gentleman will recognize that the subject is very carefully outlined; then we bring the subject matters that are discussed together, although there may be an interval of several days between the times in which the

hearings are held. Sometimes it happens that we must go to print with a part of the hearings, and let other parts follow along. Of course, it is unfortunate that at any time there should be consideration of subjects not in one compact place. We have done the best we could. I think the index to the hearings will supply the deficiency that possibly exists in the arrangement of the subjects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then I take it that it is the thought of the chairman to try and have a compact debate in one compact day and thus relieve the general membership of the House of the necessity of reading the 800 pages of testimony?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Idaho hopes that the Members of the House will have a great deal of confidence in the members of the committee who present the subject. We are not asking that the debate be closed to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We do have that confidence of which the gentleman speaks, but I notice, incidentally, that at this moment the assistant to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has just taken his place at the table with about a half wheelbarrow load of additional documents, all compact and all important, I feel quite sure. I hope that I am not trespassing too much upon the time of the distinguished leader who wants to get ahead with the appropriation bills, but I shall take just enough time to state that in my opinion the making of appropriation bills in these committees by small subcommittees, with a copy of the Budget in their hands 40 days ahead of the time when a copy of the Budget is in the hands of the other 400 Members of Congress, coupled with a determination and desire upon their part to press the appropriation bills through with as much speed as possible, is an unfortunate practice. There is a hiatus in the proceedings. We who are not on the subcommittee are not in a fair way to ascertain what the Navy Department—or any other department for that matter—really asked for when it first went to the Budget. Members of Congress can not be informed upon every subject, and it is unfortunate that they have not time either to read the hearings or to sit in the committee room when they are held, to do either of which is vital to a proper understanding of the appropriations and what is going on in the way of appropriations. It seems that there might be some way by which Members who are not members of the Appropriations Committee might help that committee without appearing to be in the rôle of interlopers or of obstructionists or of particular opposition to any particular Budget program. I take it that the Budget Bureau does not really intend to be a body superior to Congress itself.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15641, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in making a general statement on the naval appropriation bill, I am going to follow the course that I followed two years ago, rather than the course that I followed a year ago, and ask the opportunity of making a general statement on the bill without interruption, after which I shall be glad to be interrogated, if there is anyone who compliments me enough to want to ask a question. Also, I suggest that under the five-minute rule it is my thought to be very generous in debate, and that we may at that time, when we have the particular subject matter before us, answer the interrogations that will be pertinent to the immediate subject.

The Navy appropriation bill is necessarily one of the greatest of the supply bills that come before the Congress, and this year it carries in direct and indirect appropriations the amount of \$324,394,680, as against \$334,074,575 in the current year. At

this point I insert in my remarks a short table showing the direct and indirect appropriations to which I have referred:

	Appropriated, 1927, including deficiency and supplemental appropriations	Estimated, 1928	Proposed, 1928
Direct appropriations:			
Navy Department.....	\$4,289,570	\$4,184,800	\$4,289,830
Naval service.....	315,628,005	310,518,850	310,262,850
Total.....	319,917,575	314,703,650	314,552,680
Indirect appropriations, naval service.....	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Contract authorizations, naval service.....	9,082,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Reappropriation, naval service.....	75,000	12,000	842,000
Grand total.....	334,074,575	323,715,650	324,394,680

¹ Exclusive of \$1,115,000, more in the nature of a bookkeeping transaction.

The moneys for the current year to which I have referred include not only the appropriations carried in the appropriation bill of a year ago, but also the supplemental appropriations that were carried in deficiency bills; and in that connection we must look ahead to certain supplemental estimates that probably will come to the Congress and will need to be included in the Budget before this Congress shall adjourn for the fiscal year 1927 or for 1928.

It is very possible, for instance, that authorization will be made for increase of limit of cost on the two aircraft carriers, and if so that will require, in a rough way, \$3,500,000.

Your committee has no authority to bring in recommendations of money for that purpose at this time. We understand also that certain deficiency estimates in connection with submarine modifications will come in that will aggregate, possibly, another \$1,250,000. We understand that, possibly, estimates will come in, assuming that there will be legislative authorization, for the modernization of a couple of the older battleships, and if that should be done it will again claim another appropriation that will probably run into seven figures.

I mention these things now so that you will not think that the problem is solved, when you may pass this appropriation bill, so far as moneys may be concerned.

We have heard a great deal during the last several days about the state of the Navy, the ships that we have in comparison with the ships of other navies, and only the other day the statement was carried in the newspapers of a speech delivered in another body in which it was declared that if we should have one more limitation of armament conference we would have no Navy at all.

Of course, such statements are calculated largely for propaganda purposes. Such statements as that are inaccurate. They oftentimes do not do justice to the ordinary candor of those who make them.

I want at this time to place in the RECORD a statement showing the allocation of the ships of the United States Navy during the current year 1927 and during the proposed year 1928, the types of the different ships, and it will appear that we appropriate in this bill money to care for 320 ships of the United States Navy for 1928 in commission, apart from vessels assigned to shore activities:

	Vessels in commission		Vessels not in commission		Vessels assigned to shore activities in commission		Total	
	1927	1928, proposed for	1927	1928	1927	1928	1927	1928
Battleships:								
First line.....	15	16					18	18
First line (reduced commission).....	3	2						
Cruisers, second line.....	4	2	6	8	1	1	11	11
Light cruisers:								
First line.....	10	10					10	10
Second line.....	3	2	8	9			11	11
Aircraft carriers:								
First line.....	12	2					2	2
Second line.....	1	1					1	1
Mine layers, second line.....	2	2	2	2			4	4

¹ Reduced commission, floating oil storage.

² Not yet completed.

	Vessels in commission		Vessels not in commission		Vessels assigned to shore activities in commission		Total	
	1927	1928, proposed for	1927	1928	1927	1928	1927	1928
Destroyers:								
First line	103	103	156	156	3	3	262	262
Second line			8	8			8	8
Light mine layers	6	6	8	8			14	14
Submarines:								
First line	48	48	2	2			50	50
Second line	29	29	36	36			65	65
Fleet submarines, first line	4	5	2	2			6	7
Patrol vessels:								
Eagles	3		34	37	16	16	53	53
Gunboats	12	12	1	3			13	13
Converted yachts	6	6	2	2			8	8
Subchasers			5	4	25	23	30	27
Auxiliaries:								
Destroyer tenders	6	6	3	3			9	9
Submarine tenders	7	6	2	3			9	9
Aircraft tenders	1	1					1	1
Repair ships	2	2	1	1			3	3
Store ships	2	2	3	3			5	5
Colliers	1	1	4	4			5	5
Oilers	9	9	9	9	12	12	20	20
Ammunition ships	1	1	1	1			2	2
Cargo ships	3	3	3	3			6	6
Transports	2	2					2	2
Hospital ships	2	2	1	1			3	3
Ocean tugs	7	7	11	11	19	19	37	37
Mine sweepers	24	27	11	11	8	5	43	43
Miscellaneous	5	5					5	5
Unclassified:			9	9	22	22	31	31
Ferryboats and launches					21	21	21	21
Ambulance boats			1	1	2	2	3	3
District patrol vessels			2	3	2	2	4	5
Harbor tugs			4	3	55	55	59	58
Crane ships			1	1			1	1
Unclassified: District craft					7	7	7	7
Total	323	320	336	344	183	178	842	842

* Reduced commission, floating oil storage.

I have indicated in figures the amount of money that we are carrying in the pending bill, and I have indicated by way of comparison the moneys carried for the current year. But there is something more important when great policies are involved than the amount of money allowed for a particular purpose. There is something more important than whether or not we shall appropriate nearly \$325,000,000 for the Navy for the coming fiscal year. The country is concerned in whether or not we are maintaining an adequate Navy. It is concerned in whether or not we are fairly complying with the obligations we assumed in the limitation of armament treaty. We are rightfully concerned in whether or not we are engaged in a program that will mean competition in armaments upon the part of the nations of the world, either by making ourselves so inefficient that nations of limited wealth will assume they can outstrip us and that we do not care or through a program of building that is extravagant we inspire other nations to raise that issue by increasing their naval establishments.

That you may answer this question you must consider a number of factors. You must consider the ships maintained by the American Navy and the ships of similar types maintained by the other nations that are signatory to the limitation treaty. You must consider the readiness of the Navy to respond in event of need. You must consider the number of officers and men and their efficiency. You must consider the Navy from the standpoint of its ability to perform any service that it might be called upon to undertake. I want to give the House a picture of our Navy and ask you to consider with me the several factors that are most outstanding that enter into a well-rounded naval establishment.

The terms set forth in the limitation of armaments treaty define the number and tonnage of battleships, the tonnage of aircraft carriers, and the maximum tonnage of individual units; the maximum tonnage of all other kinds of individual ships, although not the sum total of other tonnage. It defines the caliber of guns that may be carried on the different types, and other lesser details looking to the carrying out of these essential factors.

BATTLESHIPS

Consider first the battleship situation. In the limitation of armament treaty the limit was fixed on the number of ships of this type that each of the powers signatory to the treaty might

have, their tonnage individually and in the aggregate, and the maximum caliber of guns. The terms are as follows:

Type	United States		Great Britain		Japan		France		Italy	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Battleship, first line, built	18	525,850	18	525,850	6	191,320	6	138,768	5	108,360
Building, first line	0		2	70,000	0		0		0	
Built, second line	0		0		0		3	55,776	2	25,310
Built, cruisers, first line	0		4	122,700	4	110,000	0		0	
Totals	18	525,850	22	580,450	10	301,320	9	194,544	7	133,670

* Nelson and Rodney, building to replace Ajax, Centurian, King George V, and Thunderer. When this replacement is effected, as it will be within a year, the capital ship tonnage for the British Empire will be (20 ships) 558,950 tons.

Other provisions were made touching the United States under which we were to substitute the *Colorado* and *West Virginia* for the *North Dakota* and *Delaware*. Provisions were made under which Japan, France, and Italy would perform certain definite building or replacement programs and under which general rules were outlined, and in addition to this, general rules for replacement were outlined for all the nations that were parties to the treaty.

Great Britain was given slightly more tonnage than the United States because of the inferior character of certain of her ships in comparison with the battleships of the United States and of Japan. The country must assume that a fair ratio on battleships, on tonnage of substitute battle cruisers, was attained when the conference treaty was made. Now, may I ask whether anything has happened since this treaty was agreed to that so far as battleships are concerned tends to lessen the strength of the United States within the ratio? My answer is emphatically that no such thing has occurred. On the other hand, the position of the United States is better than it was by reason of things that we have been able to do wholly within the terms of the treaty. Great Britain's powerful dreadnaughts—the *Nelson* and the *Rodney*—will take their positions shortly in the British line. Our replacement ships—the *Colorado* and the *West Virginia*—have already taken their place in our line. Great Britain among her 20 ships that will stand in lieu of our 18 battleships has 5 that are coal burners, and it is not planned, so far as we know, that they be changed. The United States when the treaty was signed had six coal burners among her battleships. The last year witnessed the conversion of three of these ships into oil burners and the modernization of these three ships as well. The three remaining coal burners are at this time in the navy yards being transformed into oil burners and being modernized. They will take their places in the American Navy in about 10 months, or within the fiscal year for which we are now appropriating. Consider here that only one of the capital ships of Great Britain is to-day equipped with catapults and airplanes and that every battleship of the United States, and every cruiser regards catapults and airplanes as a part of its necessary equipment and is provided with them.

Other comparisons can be made touching speed and range of guns and touching antitorpedo protection, but on the whole these comparisons are not to the discredit of the ships of the American Navy.

The question of the comparative strength of the battleships of the United States and Great Britain was considered by the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee two years ago, when Colonel Roosevelt, the then Assistant Secretary, was before the committee. A colloquy occurred that indicates the thought at that time of this responsible officer connected with the Navy Department. The colloquy, in part, is as follows:

Mr. FRENCH. Is it true that on an average our capital ships are more modern and are better ships in every way than the British ships?

Colonel ROOSEVELT. Yes; on an average. I remember the expression used by Admiral Chatfield at the time we were talking about that. He said, "The tail of your column is not as good as the tail of our column, but the body of your column and the head of your column are very much better than any of the rest of our column."

The British believe that in battleships the advantage lies with the United States, and I may say further there is not an American who is familiar with our capital ships who would not readily agree to the suggestion that our capital ships are equal to the capital ships of the British Navy.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

The other treaty ship, where tonnage is limited, is the aircraft carrier. Here is a naval ship of a new type. Even now it is in its experimental stage. Under the treaty basis of 5-5-3 aircraft-carrier tonnage is limited to a maximum of 135,000 tons for each Great Britain and the United States, and three-fifths of that amount for Japan, and proportionate ratios for France and Italy. Furthermore, no carrier may be built of greater tonnage than 27,000 tons, with the exception of carriers that were defined in the treaty as permissible to build through the conversion of cruisers that were under construction. The status of ships of this type is as follows:

Type	United States		Great Britain		Japan		France		Italy
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	
Aircraft carriers, first line:									
Built.....	0		2	41,890	0		0		0
Building.....	2	66,000	2	37,200	2	53,800	1	21,160	0
Aircraft carriers, second line, built.....	1	12,700	2	25,400	1	9,500	0		0
Total.....	3	78,700	6	104,490	3	63,300	1	21,160	0

A moment ago I said that the aircraft carrier is a ship of a new type. It was not known until a few years ago that we could take off from the deck of a ship or effect a landing upon it. We have proceeded cautiously in the matter. Our experimental ship is the *Langley*, not built originally as an aircraft carrier. Great Britain has two experimental ships of similar tonnage, and Japan one experimental ship, three-fourths as large. The experimentation that the Aviation Service of the Navy has carried forward on the *Langley* has proven of the highest value. It has definitely determined matters that have to do with taking off in flight, that have to do with landing, that have to do with the construction of aircraft and carriers, touching design from a multitude of angles. The *Saratoga* and *Lexington*, which are now rapidly approaching completion, will receive the benefits of the experimentation upon the *Langley*. They are better ships than if they had been completed four years ago. In tonnage we are not up to the ratio figure, but from the standpoint of efficiency we are making progress. Better that we proceed slowly and build new carriers when we may be satisfied that we have perfected proper and adequate designs than that we rush forward in the construction of carriers, so that in the shortest possible time we could attain the tonnage permitted in the treaty. Otherwise our aircraft carriers might be of a type upon their completion that we would need to regard as obsolete or obsolescent.

I take it that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House must have been impressed with this point of view and must have been controlled by it, for that committee has not brought in a bill authorizing the construction of an additional aircraft carrier beyond the three that the United States has completed, or is in process of completing.

CRUISERS

We now come to the cruiser situation. First of all, I am going to ask you to consider a table which is before you, and which I shall ask to have incorporated in my remarks at this point:

Cruisers and light cruisers

	United States		Great Britain		Japan		France		Italy	
	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons
Cruisers and light cruisers at time of treaty:										
Cruisers built.....	10	131,300	4	58,200	4	34,756	10	120,359	5	46,500
Light cruisers built.....	3	11,250	63	300,870	13	60,290	9	44,676	10	39,100
Light cruisers building.....	10	75,000			5	26,000				
Total.....	23	217,550	67	359,070	22	121,046	19	165,035	15	85,600
Cruisers completed since treaty:										
Light cruisers, first line.....	10	75,000	6	38,750	12	67,505	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

¹ Not available as to France and Italy.

Cruisers and light cruisers—Continued

	United States		Great Britain		Japan		France		Italy	
	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons
Cruisers and light cruisers to-day:										
Light cruisers, first line.....	10	75,000	40	194,200	19	102,005	3	16,731	8	30,734
Light cruisers, second line.....	11	39,975	9	48,380	6	27,362	1	3,395	2	6,274
Cruisers, second line.....	11	139,450			7	64,098	10	118,333	3	31,228
Total.....	31	254,425	49	242,580	32	193,465	13	138,459	13	68,296
Building and projected:										
Light cruisers, first line, building.....	2	20,000	11	110,000	6	54,200	6	53,619	2	20,000
Authorized and appropriated for.....	3	30,000	3	28,000			1	10,000		
Authorized but not appropriated for.....	3		9							

From much that has been said in the press and in public speeches and from the vast amount of propaganda literature that has been coming to our desks we would be led to believe that Great Britain and Japan are engaged in a mad rush in cruiser building and that these nations are not acting in good faith and have not acted in good faith since the armament agreement. The proponents recite that cruisers under the treaty are not specifically limited as to number, but they say that the spirit of the 5-5-3 agreement applies to cruisers. I could wish that there was an agreement that would apply to all types of crafts and am quite willing to accept the formula as applying to cruisers, providing those who are engaged in a cruiser campaign will accept the formula touching all factors that enter into naval defense.

Pending such an agreement, we must take into consideration all the factors, the predominance of one nation in one factor as against the predominance of another nation in another factor, and go ahead on the basis of a program that will be measurably just and fair toward all; that will not inspire the thought that the United States is cringing and will not maintain her defenses, or that, on the other hand, will not inspire the thought that the United States is bent on a competitive building program. One of the greatest American philosopher humorists said, "It ain't what we know that hurts us, it is what we know that ain't so."

That is the difficulty touching naval programs.

Now, let us consider the cruiser chart that I have presented. How has the situation changed since the Washington treaty? At the time of the treaty the United States had 13 cruisers and, in addition, 9 gunboats that are now listed as cruisers but that are not shown on the chart at the time of the treaty. These 22 ships were from 3,000 tons to nearly 16,000 tons, and in speed were rated from 21 to 27 knots. Great Britain had 67 cruisers with an average of less than 5,500 tons and only 10 that were above 5,440 tons.

In speed they ranked with ours. Japan had 17 cruisers that in tonnage and speed rated about with the cruisers of Great Britain and the United States.

It may be said that many of the cruisers in this list were old, and that is true—true of the United States, true of cruisers of all three nations, in fact—and many of them must be classified as cruisers of the second class and not fit for great service. Two of ours go back to the nineties—the *Rochester* and the *Olympia*—and are probably retained largely through sentiment. Seven other light cruisers go back to 1900-1905 and 3 light cruisers and 10 second-line cruisers go back to 1905-1910. At the time of the limitations conference one of Japan's was of the 1899 vintage, another of 1904. Whether or not they are included in her list to-day I do not know.

Of Great Britain's 67, 13 go back to 1914-1916, while 24 appear to have been withdrawn from service.

Notice, too, that the United States was building 10 cruisers, Great Britain none, and Japan 5.

You will notice from the chart that the cruisers at the time of the treaty were not classified as cruisers of the first and second line—they were listed in a common column. The figures furnished us at the present and recent hearings list the ships

of the various types as belonging to the first or second line, depending upon their fitness as fighting units.

Now, may I direct your attention to the changes in the situation since the armament treaty was agreed to? The United States since that time, or in 1923 to 1925, has completed 10 cruisers of the first line, with a tonnage of 7,500 tons each, and with a speed of 33.7 knots. Great Britain since the treaty has completed 6 cruisers of the first line and Japan has completed 12. Now, notice the cruisers listed in the present service of each country. The United States has 10 cruisers of 7,500 tons each of the first line and 22 of the second line. Great Britain has 40 cruisers of the first line and 9 of the second, while Japan has 19 of the first line and 13 of the second. You will notice that of Great Britain's 67 cruisers at the time of the treaty five years ago, 24 no longer appear and 9 are listed by our officers as belonging to the second line, all this on account of age and tonnage and lack of efficiency of the craft.

Now, turn for a moment to the cruiser-building program of the several nations. The United States is building 2 cruisers of the 10,000-ton class. Three more have been appropriated for, while 3 others have been authorized. Great Britain is building 11 cruisers of the 10,000-ton class, 3 more have been appropriated for of somewhat less tonnage, and 9 additional cruisers, tonnage not indicated, have been authorized, but not appropriated for. Japan is building 6 cruisers slightly under the 10,000-ton class.

We have been told that by 1932, when these programs shall have been completed, not including the cruisers authorized, but not appropriated for, the United States will have 15 cruisers of the first line, Great Britain will have 54, and Japan 25. Remember in this connection that by 1932, 19 of the 54 British cruisers will be more than 15 years old, and on the rule that the American officers apply to the Navy of the United States, will have to take their place in the second line, so that instead of there being 54 cruisers in Great Britain's first line navy, there will be but 35.

Consider another factor, tonnage: In 1932, 5 of the cruisers of the United States will be of the 10,000-ton class; 10 will be of the 7,500-ton class. All of them will be not older than 10 years and some of them only fresh from the shipbuilding yards.

Of Great Britain's new cruisers, 11 will be of the 10,000-ton class and 3 somewhat less, while Japan will have but 6 cruisers that will be in the class with the best cruisers of either Great Britain or the United States.

Furthermore, of these 54 cruisers of Great Britain in 1932, 34 will be under 5,000 tons, and three-fourths of the cruisers of Japan of approximately the same tonnage.

So, then, while it is true that the United States now and in 1932 will be short of the 5-5-3 ratio in cruisers, our shortage is not the shortage that the propagandists for a competitive shipbuilding program would have us believe, and it is a shortage that is offset in large degree by another factor to which I shall direct attention.

In the meantime I stand for the policy of orderly procedure in our development, and procedure in harmony with every effort that our country should make to reduce by agreement the burdens of armament.

IS THERE A MAD RACE IN CRUISER BUILDING ON THE PART OF GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN?

So much has been said in the press about a mad race in competitive cruiser building on the part of Great Britain and Japan that I must not let the criticism go unanswered. The United States, by way of repetition, is now building two 10,000-ton cruisers. We have made appropriations for three more, and work upon them will begin in a few months. Three more have been authorized, and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House has placed upon the calendar a bill providing for 10 more 10,000-ton cruisers, of which I assume three may be regarded as taking the place of the three heretofore authorized but not appropriated for.

Now turn to Great Britain. Great Britain is building to-day 11 cruisers of the 10,000-ton class and 3 of a class slightly lower. In addition to this, nine cruisers have been authorized, and the papers within the last few days have carried the statement that one of them is to be built shortly.

Turn to Japan. Japan is to-day building six cruisers of the 10,000-ton class or slightly under. Surely there is nothing in this program to arouse apprehension. Four of these six are still on the ways—they have not been launched—while two others are far behind in their program of construction.

We are told that Japan has a most important navy-building program that she is about to undertake. But what are the

facts? One year ago the marine minister of Japan proposed a shipbuilding program that would cover a period of four years, that would entail an expenditure of approximately \$147,000,000. That program called for 33 ships—

Cruisers	4
Destroyers	16
Submarines	5
River gunboats	3
Repair ship	1
Airship carrier	1
Oil tanker	1
Mine layers	2

That program was rejected. Within the last few weeks another program has been submitted by the minister of marine. The new program calls for an expenditure of about \$130,600,000 over a period of five years. This program, as to number of ships, calls for—

Cruisers	4
Destroyers	15
Submarines	5
River gunboats	3
Airplane carrier	1
Mine layer	1

From the foregoing this program is \$16,400,000 under the program of a year ago, and calls for a spread over five years instead of four. What the fate of this program will be is for the Japanese administration and the Diet to determine. To the present it has not been approved, but may I direct your attention to the most significant factor in connection with the program.

For the next fiscal year the marine minister has asked, under the program, \$2,300,000, and for the year following \$5,960,000. I direct particular attention to these small estimates of expenditure for the first two years to emphasize my thought that Japan is not engaged in any mad shipbuilding program. The marine minister calls for an expenditure of \$130,600,000 for new ships tentatively allocated over a period of five years, and then asks that less than 2 per cent of it be expended the first year and less than 5 per cent of it the second year. What does this mean? Surely not that Japan is engaged in a mad race for competitive shipbuilding. Rather, it means that Japan is proceeding cautiously; that she has hopes that through a further limitation-of-arms conference it may be possible for her to abandon part of what now seems to be a necessary program. Failing in that, doubtless she contemplates that with an expenditure of less than 7 per cent during the first two years of a five-year program she will spread the balance of the total not over the remaining three years but over several or many additional years.

Gentlemen, let us be fair in this matter. Let us recognize the truth. Let us not be swept off our feet and plunged into an unwarranted shipbuilding program by those who draw inferences from actions that are taken by other nations.

DESTROYERS

We now come to another important type of ship—the destroyer. The destroyer is a screening ship essentially. It is swift; it is agile. It can not perform the service of the cruiser of larger tonnage. It is a ship of the type that can not be dispensed with in a modern fleet. At this point I direct your attention to the number of destroyers and the tonnage of the limitation-treaty nations:

	United States		British Empire		Japan	
	Num-ber	Tonnage	Num-ber	Tonnage	Num-ber	Tonnage
Destroyers first line:						
Built	262	312,479	169	194,575	78	85,650
Building			2	2,540	6	8,670
Authorized and appropriated for					8	11,560
Total	262	312,479	171	197,115	92	105,880
Authorized, but not appropriated for	12		27		0	
Destroyers, leaders, first line:						
Built			18	31,310		
Building						
Authorized and appropriated for					4	7,400
Total			18	31,310	4	7,400
Destroyers, second line, built	8	5,236	6	4,200	12	7,850

As important as is the destroyer in any navy, those who are urging a competitive shipbuilding program have not directed attention to the fact that the United States has 262 destroyers of the first line, against 169 destroyers of the first line of Great Britain and 78 of Japan. Here the ratio is tremendously in favor of the United States. This is true notwithstanding the fact that Great Britain has 18 destroyer leaders, which, after all, are destroyers of somewhat larger tonnage and speed.

This situation and the cruiser situation were in the minds of those who sat around the conference table that shaped the limitation agreement. The United States was weak in cruiser strength in comparison with Great Britain, but Great Britain and Japan were weak in destroyer strength in comparison with the United States.

Remember that these two types of ships can not stand great punishment, but, on the other hand, remember that they both can inflict damage upon capital ships and all other naval craft. One destroyer can not be counted as a set-off against a cruiser; but when it is remembered that the United States has nearly 100 destroyers more than Great Britain and nearly 200 more than Japan, surely the ships of this type must be regarded as having value when we recall the many cruisers of both Great Britain and Japan that belong to the 3,000 and 5,000 ton class.

SUBMARINES

There is another type of ship that I want to draw your attention to in a comparative way—the submarine. Here again is an interesting comparison, and I direct your attention to the table showing submarines and the tonnage of the different classes built or within the program of the armament-treaty nations:

	United States		Great Britain		Japan	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Fleet submarines, first line:						
Built	6	9,675	4	8,680	6	10,110
Building			3	4,145	5	7,000
Authorized and appropriated for			6	8,070	9	11,970
Total	6	9,675	13	20,895	20	29,080
Cruiser submarines, first line:						
Building	2					
Authorized and appropriated for						
Total	2					
Submarines, first line:						
Built	50	43,822	28	25,150	43	34,834
Building			1	890	2	1,663
Total	50	43,822	29	26,040	45	36,497
Authorized but not appropriated for	1					
Mine-laying submarines, first line:						
Built			3	2,670		
Building	1				3	3,000
Total	1		3	2,670	3	3,000
Monitor type submarines, first line: Built			2	3,200		
Submarines, second line:						
Built	65	31,282	24	10,368	10	3,259
Building						
Authorized and appropriated for						
Total	65	31,282	24	10,368	10	3,259
Mine-laying submarines, second line: Built						

The submarine situation again is favorable rather than unfavorable to the United States. Some of the discussions that have appeared in the public press recently have directed attention to the fact that Great Britain and Japan have in what are classified as fleet submarines built and building larger numbers than the United States. Two factors must be taken into account, however, in considering this question.

In the first place, Great Britain is credited with building three of this type, Japan five, and the United States none. On the other hand, the United States is building two submarines that are classified as cruiser submarines, while of this type Great Britain and Japan are building none. The fleet submarines and the cruiser submarines are intended for similar purposes. In this program the different nations are

competing with each other for efficiency, speed, radius, and safety. The submarine belongs to a type of ship that is of comparatively recent origin. It is only 10 years ago that the Allied Powers were in consternation over the feat of the German cruiser submarine when she came to the shores of America and departed, making a safe return to her home port. What the future may hold in submarine building we do not know.

I direct attention to the fact that the submarines that are listed as fleet submarines of Japan, Great Britain, and the United States are in tonnage small in comparison with what naval engineers believe must be the most efficient fleet submarine of the future, but whatever balance may be against the United States touching fleet and cruiser submarines, it is more than offset by the preponderance in favor of the United States of the large number of other efficient submarines.

OFFICER AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL

We now come to the officer and enlisted personnel of the Navy. On September 30 last there were 5,117 line officers on the active list, of which number 62 were additional numbers. On the same date there were 1,948 staff officers and 1,466 chief warrant and warrant officers, a grand total of 8,531. This bill provides the money for 5,262 officers of the line, 1,969 staff officers, and for 1,479 chief warrant and warrant officers, a grand total of 8,710.

The authorized number of line officers is 5,499 on the basis of the authorized strength of 137,485. We will be 237 short of that number in 1928, according to the pay figures. The actual number is quite conjectural, because there are many influencing elements.

We have carried in the bill provision for 82,500 men, the same as the current year. When the Navy Department submitted its first estimate to the Budget, a tentative number of men for 1928, the department called for 86,000 enlisted personnel, but upon consideration of all the factors entering into the situation a lesser number was agreed upon and estimated for by the Budget. Upon the basis of 86,000 enlisted personnel the department allocated for sea duty 60,017 and for shore duty 25,983. When officers of the department were before your subcommittee we were advised that on September 30, 1926, on a basis of 82,500 enlisted personnel for the current year, we had the following allocation: Sixty thousand one hundred and forty-five at sea and 22,495 on shore. When then we bring to you a bill making provision for 82,500 enlisted personnel for the coming fiscal year we have made provision for all the men at sea that the department would send to sea—if we had made provision for 86,000 men—or, in other words, 60,017. In addition to this we have made provision for men assigned to shore duty in the number 22,483, or almost exactly the same round figure that defined the men on shore on September last.

How does our enlisted personnel compare with the enlisted personnel of other nations signatory to the limitation treaty? The following table indicates this situation as of October 1, 1926 (Japan, July 1, 1926):

	Officers	Men	Total
United States regular Navy	8,531	82,910	91,441
British Empire regular Navy	7,801	82,637	90,438
Dependencies	973	9,572	10,545
Civil crews of auxiliaries	528	3,626	4,154
Total	9,302	95,835	105,137
Japan regular Navy	7,703	68,338	76,041
France regular Navy	3,570	53,000	56,570
Italy regular Navy	2,710	40,124	42,834

The foregoing figures were furnished to your committee by the Navy Department, but there are several factors that must be taken into account in order that they may present a true picture. First, the item for civilians, listed as 528 officers and 3,626 enlisted men in the British Navy, must be disallowed in comparing the man power of the British Navy with the Navy of the United States. These figures must be disallowed in making comparison for the reason that these officers and men are doing a service that we are hiring civilian agencies to perform, or else a service that we do not need to do because of the fact that our country is compact instead of embracing far-flung territories, as go to make up the realm of the British Empire. Second, the coast guard service for Great Britain is performed by her navy. The coast guard service for her dependencies is performed by officers and men listed in the figures I have indicated for the British Navy. On the other hand, the United States performs that service through a Coast Guard that in time of peace is under the Treasury Department and whose officers and men are not included in the numbers of

officers and men for the United States that I have indicated. In the Coast Guard of the United States we have more than 9,000 officers and men. These officers and men would be carried into the Navy as part of the Navy of the United States in event of war. These officers and men are to-day performing a work that is calculated to keep them fit in a degree far greater than much of the service that is performed by officers and men listed as part of and properly credited to the British Navy.

There are other controversial factors, such as the marine service of the two countries, the aviation service, and the indefinite number of civilian employees who in one country are doing work that in the other country is performed by officers and enlisted men. We can not know definitely of all of these conflicts, and I think that after I shall have made the statement that I am about to make you will say that it is rather immaterial that we pursue the question further.

The prime service of an enlisted personnel is to do the work of the Navy at sea, to man ships, to handle guns, to handle aircraft, to care for and operate the technical machinery and equipment that modern ships of war contain, and not primarily to do any considerable amount of work on shore that can be handled by civilians quite as well.

On September 30 last the United States had 82,910 enlisted personnel. Of this number the Navy Department has advised us that we had afloat 73 per cent, or 60,525 men. We actually had afloat on that date 60,145 men. On the same date Great Britain, excluding her civilian crews that under no consideration should be counted for our present purpose as part of the British Navy, had 59,006 enlisted men, or 64.1 per cent of 92,209 enlisted personnel in her Navy, including all the enlisted personnel of the British Isles and the dependencies of Great Britain as well.

Japan on July 1 last had an enlisted personnel of 68,338. Of that number she had afloat 60 per cent, or 41,003 men. So then, when it comes to a comparison of the three enlisted personnel afloat of Great Britain, the United States and Japan, having in mind a ratio that does not in so many words apply to enlisted personnel we find that the figures are almost in exact accord with that ratio. The true figures would be: United States, 60,000 men; Great Britain, 60,000 men; Japan, 40,000 men.

The allocation of the dates that I have indicated, October 1 and July 1 last, gave the United States 60,145. Great Britain 59,006, Japan 41,003.

THE NAVAL RESERVE

The estimates on account of the Naval Reserve are presented under the following heads:

	Appropriation, 1927	Estimate, 1928	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Naval Reserve.....	\$3,820,800	\$3,850,000	+\$29,140
Pay of the Navy:			
Transferred men.....	6,807,660	7,980,000	+1,172,340
Clothing outfits.....	(1)	(1)	
Aviation (new aircraft and equipment).....		235,000	+235,000
Total.....	10,628,520	12,065,000	+1,436,480

¹ Not separated from regular service issues.

FLEET RESERVE

The plans call for a total of 1,000 officers and 12,192 men apart from aviation, and 612 officers and 1,352 men for aviation units, or a total of 1,612 officers and 13,544 men. The present total strength applicable to these objectives is 1,063 officers and 7,815 men. The estimates as presented provide for 1,280 officers and 8,290 men, or, omitting aviation, 1,000 officers and 8,020 men.

This is a very difficult appropriation for which to estimate, as service is purely voluntary. A determined effort is being made to rid the fleet reserve of those who do not manifest a proper degree of interest. The committee is watching this situation because it feels sure that the Congress does not wish to put a single dollar under this head which the Navy could well use in other ways, where there is not a measurably adequate return.

RESERVE AVIATION

The amount carried for reserve aviation, including \$235,000 for new aircraft and equipment under the appropriation, "Aviation, Navy," is \$1,048,329, divided as follows:

Pay and allowances, including travel and subsistence.....	\$398,013
New aircraft and equipment.....	235,000
Maintenance and operation of planes and stations.....	329,888
Pay and subsistence of transferred reservists (former enlisted men).....	85,428
Total.....	1,048,329

LXVIII—69

The current appropriation is \$826,462. As previously pointed out, the objective of this organization is 612 officers and 1,352 men. At the present time about one-third of the officer strength is available or will be by the end of the fiscal year, and something under one-fifth of the enlisted strength. The estimates provide for giving training to 280 officers and 270 men, and to 66 student aviators, cutting down, however, on the flight training of the officers from 45 to 28½ hours. As to the wisdom of this the committee will not attempt to express an opinion. If detrimental, it would seem to be more than compensated for by the plan to send 50 reserve aviators to the fleet to serve in the capacity of aviators for a period of one year. The committee heartily indorses this plan. It may lead ultimately to the solution of the question of regular service officer pilots.

VOLUNTEER NAVAL RESERVE

The Volunteer Naval Reserve is composed of officers and men divided into various subclasses in accordance with the duties they will be called upon to perform in the event of war. Officers and men of this class are not entitled by law to receive pay for drill attendance, but they are entitled to receive pay and allowances while performing active training duty, the same as members of the fleet reserve.

There were 2,507 officers and 11,011 men in the Volunteer Naval Reserve on September 30, 1926.

TRANSFERRED MEN

This class, known as transferred men, is composed of men who have completed 16 or 20 years' service in the Navy. If transferred after 16 years' service, they receive annually one-third of their pay plus all permanent additions at time of transfer, and if they transfer after 20 years' service they receive annually one-half of their pay plus all permanent additions at time of transfer. The estimates provide for 4,904 of the 16-year men and 3,326 of the 20-year men. The appropriation necessary is \$7,953,961.30. Under the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1080), no transfers can be made before the completion of 20 years' service by men enlisting subsequently to the date of approval of such act.

The committee can not state with accuracy, but believes investigation will disclose that many of these transferred—virtually retired—men served their entire enlistments in clerical capacities; that is, in ratings calling for the performance of duties of a clerical nature. It suggests further consideration of the legislation touching the Naval Reserve with the view to confining its benefits to men in those ratings which it is apparent it would be difficult to fill in time of emergency.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Budget estimates provide for a force of 16,800 enlisted men in the Marine Corps, or 1,200 fewer men than provided by current appropriations.

The authorized strength of the Marine Corps is 27,400 men, or one-fifth of the authorized strength of the Navy. This bill makes provision for 82,500 men in the Navy, or 60 per cent of its authorized strength. The number proposed in the Budget for the Marine Corps, 16,800, represents 61 per cent of its authorized strength. Viewing the matter from such an angle, it would appear that the Marine Corps might well stand such a cut.

The primary mission of the Marine Corps, however, is to have in readiness a well trained and equipped body of men to accompany or precede the fleet as an advance base force if and when the need should arise. This purpose seems to have become more and more subservient to missions entirely foreign to the main reason for the corps' existence, with the result that but a relatively small part of the corps' appropriations may be said to be on account of its primary object. To bring about a reduction in the Marine Corps the committee believes it will be necessary to consider more than the relationship a certain number bears or contributes to a total actual or potential force. It involves a question of administrative policy with respect to the employment of the force provided in excess of properly constituted advance base units, and any change in the present policy no doubt would require provision being made in other directions. The two would need to be considered simultaneously.

Entertaining such a conviction, the committee has been unable to accept the Budget proposal and is recommending appropriations and reappropriations that it believes will enable the corps to continue during the fiscal year 1928 with approximately its present year force. The resultant allowance over the Budget proposal amounts to \$830,000, which has been entirely provided by the reappropriation of unexpended balances of Marine Corps appropriations for the fiscal year 1925.

The bill makes provision for 1,020 commissioned officers, the current year number, for 155 warrant officers, for 362 trans-

ferred fleet reservists, for 2,600 assigned men, and for training 807 members of the Marine Corps Reserve. The committee has refused to provide for an increase in the number of assigned men.

An increase of \$279,343 has been allowed over the current appropriation to buy target-practice ammunition. The Army has been supplying this type of ammunition since the war, but the unreliability of the last consignment indicates that the Marine Corps will have to go into the market to fill its needs in the future.

The housing situation at Quantico merits very early consideration. The barracks and quarters there are makeshifts and should be replaced with permanent construction at the earliest date practicable. Had there been authorization founded on a carefully planned program the committee would have been disposed to reappropriate the remainder of the 1925 unexpended money as well as the ascertainable 1926 balances to initiate the work. Apart from the \$830,000 which the bill reappropriates there is something upward of a million dollars remaining unused of the funds appropriated for the corps for the two fiscal years indicated.

FUEL AND TRANSPORTATION

For fuel and transportation the Budget estimate is \$12,000,000, as against \$13,950,000 for the current fiscal year, a reduction of \$1,950,000. There has been a modification of the steaming plans upon which the current appropriation was based and there has been a reduction in the average price of fuel oil from \$1.5599 per barrel to \$1.41339, and in consequence of both a sum approximating \$937,000 of the current appropriation may be turned back. In view of this surplus the reduction proposed in the Budget actually is around a million dollars. The committee is proposing the Budget estimate.

The break-up of the 1928 estimate will be found on page 340 of the hearings. It will be noticed therefrom that a further decline is in prospect in the average price of fuel oil, the figure being \$1.33228 per barrel. This means, excluding other than fuel-oil factors, that on the basis of using the same quantity of fuel oil in 1928 as the revised estimate indicates will be used during the present fiscal year an appropriation somewhat under \$12,000,000 would suffice.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

In considering the Navy program up to the present time, we have had before us ships of the different essential types, aviation as it involves the Navy, and the men behind the guns. Consider for a moment the position of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan from the standpoint of economic conditions.

An eminent American naval critic, urging the other day the insufficiency of the American Navy, pointed out the many naval bases that Great Britain has and stresses this situation as an element of strength. I recognize that with the widely scattered parts of the British Empire, Great Britain must possess widely separated and numerous naval bases. These two factors are factors that must be correlated—far-flung territorial areas and widely scattered naval bases. Suppose, however, that the territory of Great Britain were compact—that Canada, Australia and South Africa, and New Zealand, and India, and the other possessions of the British Empire were as compact as the territory of the United States, there would be no occasion for the many widely separated bases. As a matter of fact, it means weakness and not strength that Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand are so far removed from the center of the British Empire.

The British Isles that we think of as the heart of Great Britain are, comparatively speaking, of small area. They possess great wealth and they possess a wonderful people, but the isles do not possess the economic factors adequate for the maintenance of the population. The people of Great Britain depend, and must depend, upon the outside world. Their dependency is for food; it is for clothing; it is for structural materials; it is for fuel and especially fuel oil. Great Britain must maintain open to her ships the lanes of the sea. To do this Great Britain must have naval bases, and Great Britain, more than the United States, is in need of types of ships such as cruisers that are swift and of widest radius of action. Great Britain must pay attention to the reserve supply of fuel oil, to materials of all kinds, in a manner that the United States does not need to consider. Stop the lanes of the sea to the ships of Great Britain and suffering would be brought to the people of the British Isles within a period of weeks, and collapse of the British Navy as a fighting force would be a matter of days.

Turn to the United States. Our country could be cut off from the rest of the world and there would be food for our

people, there would be fuel oil for our use, there would be materials of all kinds for our fabrication. The lanes of the sea might be closed to us for weeks or for years should the necessity arise. The United States within her own territory could sustain her people without suffering, and could produce the materials to meet whatever emergency naval necessities might require in resumption of active naval warfare for the protection of the interest and dignity and honor of our country.

The economic element is an element that can not be ignored by this Congress and by the country as it looks to the program of defense. It is an element of strength in our favor that can not be approached by any other nation in the world. More than that, when this element is taken into consideration with the other elements to which I have referred, the types of ships that we possess, their numbers and their tonnage, the officers and enlisted personnel, and the other factors that must be recognized which I have not discussed at length, I tell you that the position of the United States is secure.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

We now come to increase of the Navy, and all that I have presented heretofore has relation to our building program.

We now have under way two aircraft carriers, three submarines, two light cruisers building and two appropriated for and plans made, and six river gunboats.

I shall place here in my remarks a statement touching progress of this work.

Building program

Vessels, number, type, and unit cost	Appropriated in this bill		Remaining to be appropriated
	Hull and machinery	Ordnance	
2 aircraft carriers, \$44,200,000 ¹			(?)
1 submarine V-4, \$6,150,000 ¹			
2 submarines V-5 and V-6, \$6,320,000.....	\$1,750,000	\$500,000	\$1,890,000
2 light cruisers Nos. 24 and 25, \$16,750,000.....	6,250,000	4,500,000	8,250,000
3 light cruisers Nos. 26, 27, and 28, \$16,750,000.....	9,750,000	4,500,000	34,800,000
6 river gunboats, \$700,000.....			
Total.....	17,750,000	9,500,000	44,940,000
Chargeable to naval supply account fund.....	4,000,000		
	13,750,000		
	9,500,000		
Total direct appropriation for increase of the Navy.....	23,250,000		

¹ Includes initial outfit of aircraft and spares.

² Appropriations have been provided up to present limit of \$34,000,000 each for hull and machinery. This limit inadequate to extent of possibly \$3,500,000 for both vessels. Under the rule, legislation raising the limit should precede an additional appropriation.

³ Provision is made in this bill for increasing to \$6,450,000, present limitation having been imposed by this committee.

The estimated dates of completion of the vessels enumerated in the foregoing table are as follows:

Aircraft carrier <i>Saratoga</i>	May 1, 1927
Aircraft carrier <i>Lexington</i>	June 1, 1927
Submarine V-4.....	Oct. 1, 1927
Submarine V-5.....	Dec. 1, 1928
Submarine V-6.....	Mar. 1, 1929
Light cruisers Nos. 24 and 25.....	July 9, 1929

Six river gunboats, various dates from March 1, 1927, to January 1, 1928.

Some doubt prevails as to the two aircraft carriers being completed at the time indicated. It will be necessary again to raise the limits of cost. It is hoped that the additional amount required may be ascertained shortly and provided for in the interest of their early completion. Some doubt also is entertained regarding the time of completion of the submarine V-4. The fact is, all of the completion dates necessarily are approximate and simply indicate the best judgment of those in touch with the situation. Further with respect to the submarine V-4, it will be noticed that provision has been included raising the limit of cost of the hull and machinery imposed in the Navy Department and naval service appropriation act for the fiscal year 1926 from \$5,300,000 to \$5,600,000. This has been done in pursuance of the recommendation of the department, as disclosed in House Document No. 575.

Contracts for the construction of light cruisers Nos. 26, 27, and 28 have not yet been awarded. The current and the initial appropriation toward the construction of these vessels is but \$1,200,000. This bill makes a further sum of \$14,250,000 available for their construction, and the department's idea is to delay commencement so that there will be a more or less equal spread of money over the period from date of commencement to July 1, 1928, which seems to be the sensible thing to do.

As indicated in the table, the direct appropriation proposed in this bill for increase of the Navy is \$23,250,000, which is to be augmented by a further draft of \$4,000,000 on the naval supply account fund. The department is satisfied that the fund can stand this charge and has indorsed the proposal, which came to the committee in the Budget. It will be observed in this connection that the bill proposes what appears to be still another draft of \$1,115,000 on the naval supply account fund. The purpose is simply to allow bookkeeping adjustments to be made for some submarine material which got on the books of the naval supply account fund inadvertently. The material originally should have been charged to the appropriation "Increase of the Navy." The procedure will amount to the transfer of \$1,115,000 from the naval supply account fund to increase of the Navy and the transfer of it right back again. Thus it will be practicable to straighten out the accounts and at the same time release the material from the naval supply account and make it available for issue as was originally and rightfully intended.

FURTHER LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

As the Budget estimates have come to the House, no provision is included for the commencement of construction of three cruisers of treaty type, and I recognize that there is some sentiment in this Chamber favorable to a contrary program. It is because of this that as chairman of the committee I have directed attention in more detail than would ordinarily be necessary to the situation touching types of ships. We are in the midst of a readjustment program following the most disastrous war of human history. Civilization will fail in its great opportunity if it fails to do everything possible looking to the prevention of future wars. The Limitation of Armaments Conference, of nearly five years ago, was a milestone in the direction of better understanding among nations. At this time preliminary negotiations are under way with the thought of still further agreements among the world powers touching armaments. For months, last summer, representatives of your country and other nations were engaged in a preliminary conference in Geneva. This conference will resume its session next spring. This conference seeks to develop an agenda that may serve as the basis of another limitation of arms conference.

The President in his message to this Congress, less than 30 days ago, referred to the situation in these words:

This country is now engaged in negotiations to broaden our existing treaties with the great powers which deal with the elimination of competition in naval armaments. I feel that it would be unfortunate at this time and not in keeping with our attitude toward these negotiations to commence the construction of these three cruisers. Rather do I recommend to the Congress the enactment of legislation which will extend the time for beginning their construction.

Gentlemen of the House, the President of the United States, more than any other citizen of our Republic, is charged with the grave responsibility of preserving the peace of our Nation, and shaping and working out programs that are means of preserving the peace of the world. When he comes to the Congress and emphatically advises that in view of the negotiations that are pending we delay to appropriate money for the building of new cruisers, I appeal to this body to sustain the course that he recommends.

I thank the Members of the House for their patience in this rather long discussion. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Tell me where you got that list, please, that list of ships. Did you copy it out of the book? You have Dewey's fleet at Manila in there, have you not? You know very well, my friend, that those ships are not worth any more than my old automobile that I traded for \$35 worth of gasoline. My friend, tell us how many ships Great Britain will have in 1931 rated as 10,000, 8,000, and 7,500 ton cruisers? How many guns will she have on them and how many torpedo tubes, how many 21-inch torpedo tubes? Tell us how many torpedo tubes our battleships carry and how many will these cruisers carry. My friend, tell this House the facts. Did you tell them that Great Britain in 1931 will have 431 torpedo tubes to our 134? You did not tell these gentlemen that. Tell them how many Japan will have. Tell them the length of their guns, their sizes and ranges. You and I have talked many times about this, but do not put any American citizen upon such ships of war to fight the armaments of other nations. You know there are some of those ships on which you would not put a dollar for improvement; some are lying now, as you know, rusting in our

navy yards and never will be used. Now, take the modern ships and tell this House how many 8-inch guns and how many torpedo tubes they have on them ready for use. Tell them about the 75,000 tons of these cruisers that Great Britain has designed and which Great Britain proposes to build. Tell them of the 11 cruisers which Great Britain now has under construction. Further than that, tell them that France, since we signed that agreement, has built 88 ships of war and tell this House where they got the money with which to build them. [Applause.] Do not tell them about these second-hand ships. I for one will not permit an American to go to war on such a list of boats as you have there. No, my friend; no. [Applause.] That was my dream, too, my friend; but I have awakened. You know, furthermore, that the purpose of this agreement was to reduce the burden of armament, and I ask you to read to the House the preamble of that treaty of 1922. I want you to give these facts also, for you would not mislead anyone.

Mr. FRENCH. Gentlemen of the House, in response to the general question that my beloved colleague from Pennsylvania has asked I must make more than a brief statement. Before doing so may I say that we all honor our distinguished leader and chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. We love him; we know there is no one in this world more devoted to principles of humanity than is he; that there is no one under the American flag who sooner would lay down all that God has given him for the well-being of our Republic. It is because of this that we respect him, that we honor him, and that we have followed his leadership. We hope as we go through this Congress to have the benefit of his advice and his suggestions. When, however, the gentleman suggested in his interrogatory that my answer or statement was not fair, I think he will be the first one to withdraw it.

Mr. BUTLER. I withdraw it now.

Mr. FRENCH. I knew the gentleman would.

Mr. BUTLER. But I want the gentleman to tell all the story. The gentleman is incapable of making a misstatement to this House, but I want him to tell it all to them. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. There is much that I could add to my remarks touching ships and guns and personnel. On the other hand, I have not anything to change in what I have said. I told you that for sentimental or some other purposes we included certain old ships in our second line—the *Olympia* and the *Rochester*. I told you the dates of them; I told you the dates of all these ships and brought all of the information before you. I told you they were not of any great value; but, on the other hand, just as candidly and just as frankly I told you of the tonnage of the ships of Japan and of Great Britain and compared their elements of weakness and of strength. When we are talking about old ships and ships of small tonnage of our Navy we are compelled to recognize that to some extent the same principles apply to other navies, to the old ships, and to the ships of lighter tonnage. When it comes to guns and torpedoes and deck protection and hulls of ships the various nations must meet the situation for themselves.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In a moment. Now, when it comes to the question of armor, the question of torpedo tubes, the question of the size or caliber of guns and all that, we know that the engineers or the experts of the several navies of Great Britain, Japan, France, and the United States have their ideals. One nation will say that she will sacrifice guns to the reinforcement of the hull of the ship in order to make it a fighting ship for the longest time possible. Another nation says that she will sacrifice armor in order to get speed; or that she will sacrifice deck protection in order to get more guns or more speed. We can not compare navies in that way other than to say that the experts of each nation are bending every ingenuity to bring out the type that will best serve their particular purpose.

Only the other day I was reading a criticism by an expert British writer on naval affairs, Mr. Bywater, and his conclusion was that notwithstanding the discussion of guns, the longer range and different calibers of certain of the British guns, on the whole from the standpoint of guns of the battle fleets of Great Britain and the United States, Great Britain was outclassed by the guns of the American Navy. That is his judgment. It may be wrong. So it is when we take into consideration the different types of ships.

I will now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman take as his expert in protecting us a British expert, or will the gentleman take our own general board?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, the gentleman knows that our general board will control our types instead of the experts of Great Britain. We have our problems and Great Britain has hers.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the general board agree with your program in this bill?

Mr. FRENCH. In what regard?

Mr. BLACK of New York. In regard to new construction.

Mr. FRENCH. The general board would doubtless favor an appropriation for the three cruisers. The board is considering our Navy as a fighting unit. But the general board is not charged with the responsibility of further limitation of armament agreements.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The gentleman said with a sob in his voice that if the British Government did not have this great fleet that in three or four days the British could be put out of business. Now, I say as an American Congressman that if we had a scrap with Great Britain that is just what I would want to see happen. I would want to see them put out of business in three or four days.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield? I do not know that I correctly understood—

Mr. FRENCH. I yield for a question, because I want to bring my discussion to an end.

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not know whether I correctly understood the statement of the gentleman a moment ago in reference to the article by Hector Bywater that the American guns were superior to British guns on first-line ships. Did the gentleman mean in caliber or in range?

Mr. FRENCH. I did not understand that he meant in either specific regard, and I am bringing into the discussion now without having a purpose to do so, my remembrance of an article that Mr. Bywater wrote which was published possibly a month or two ago, but the conclusion—

Mr. BRITTEN. As I understood the gentleman's statement—

Mr. FRENCH. I know what Mr. Bywater's conclusion was.

Mr. BRITTEN. What was his conclusion?

Mr. FRENCH. His conclusion was that on the whole the situation was probably better for the United States than for Great Britain.

Mr. BRITTEN. On the contrary, if my good friend will permit, Hector Bywater said that 13 of the 18 first-line American ships were outranged by every British ship.

Mr. FRENCH. I think he said that in this same article. I am not talking about the details of his statement. I am talking about his conclusion.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has sought to answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and it is for the House to determine whether or not he successfully answered it. I want to ask the gentleman with respect to the matter of personnel, because I observe that his bill carries only 82,500 as the personnel. Is the gentleman as correct in his chart and his general statement which he has made as he was last year, when he told this House that we would have to have 5,000 more men than the 82,500 in the bill now under consideration? In other words, the gentleman from Idaho last year stated in the conference report to the House that we were appropriating for 82,500. I want to see how accurate the gentleman is, so the House can judge as to whether or not he is accurate in his chart. In that statement the gentleman from Idaho said:

We provide for an average enlisted strength of 82,500 men; we recede from \$800,000 of the cut of \$1,750,000 in fuel, and we provide for keeping Lakehurst open on a much reduced scale.

The action that your committee recommended when this bill was brought originally to the House had not only to do with the program for the coming fiscal year but had to do with a program for the years ahead. In other words, by the end of the next fiscal year there will be available for commission the six battleships that are either undergoing major overhaul or else are to undergo such overhaul. Those battleships, then, will require for the succeeding year—1928—should they be retained in commission, the additional number of men over the number of enlisted personnel in the Naval Establishment to-day, 2,700. Furthermore, by the end of the coming fiscal year we shall bring into active commission the two airplane carriers, the *Lexington* and the *Saratoga*.

Those two carriers will require approximately 2,340 men in addition to the men who will have to do with aviation itself and who will be detailed to those ships. In other words, in those two items alone, looking to a year from now, we shall need to provide for more than

5,000 men for the Navy for purposes other than those for which we are providing in the pending bill.

And yet the gentleman's bill now only provides for 82,500, and the gentleman told the House last year that when this session of Congress rolled around we would have to have 5,000 more men, or a total of 87,500. I wish the gentleman would explain how he reduces the Navy back to 82,500.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, I might be compelled to admit that I was wrong a year ago, but if the gentleman will read all of my statement he will see that it is not inconsistent with my statement now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am reading to the House the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. FRENCH. I know that—in part. I remember reading in the Bible where it says, "Let him that"—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman finish the quotation?

Mr. FRENCH. Has the gentleman finished his question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I have finished. Now will the gentleman finish the quotation? [Laughter.]

Mr. FRENCH. Since my friend intimates I can not finish a Biblical quotation, I shall do so. A contentious character insisted he could justify stealing by the Bible, and he quoted from the Bible as follows: "Let him that stole, steal," and he would have gotten away with it if a dear, good lady in the audience had not known her Bible better than the gentleman thought I did and said, "Read on, read on; read the next two words," and those words were "no more." [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Georgia has raised the question of the exact allocation of men. It is possible that I would have said the very words the gentleman read, but the gentleman will remember that one of the cardinal principles that was urged on the Congress a year ago by our committee was that in the 86,000 of the Naval Establishment we should seek men when we add new craft and not add new personnel with every new ship. That was what we said then and what I say now. I think probably the figures are correct as to the number of men that will be allocated to these types of ships. If so, we ought to find them within the 86,000 men. If we can do that, it would be a wicked waste of money for this Congress to appropriate more money in order to retain enlisted men in the Navy when we do not need them. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What does the gentleman propose—to take the men to man these ships out of the 82,000?

Mr. FRENCH. I am not proposing 82,000; we are making appropriation for 82,500 men. The gentleman is leaving off the words "no more." I told the gentleman that we would probably have two old cruisers out of commission; that we would probably have three battleships in commission only about two-thirds of the year; that ships are undergoing major overhaul; that we would not have airplane carriers for all the year; that probably we would have two battleships turned in for major overhaul; and that 82,500 men would be sufficient to meet the situation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman explain to the House how he stated that we appropriated more for aviation this year than we did last year, when, as a matter of fact, the total for aviation this year is \$1,900,000 less than that of last year? Is it not a fact that we appropriated \$22,365,248 and this year's bill carries \$20,455,000, showing a general reduction of \$1,910,288? Is it not a further fact that you have reduced the appropriation for new aircraft by \$3,300,000 less than last year?

Mr. FRENCH. No; what we have done is this: Last year we carried the total of \$19,256,288 and a contract authorization of \$4,100,000. For this year we have carried \$19,981,000, and in addition to that authorization for \$5,000,000 more, making \$24,981,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill carries twenty-four million for aviation? The bill carries \$20,455,000, and out of that \$20,000,000 you have to pay \$4,000,000 on last year's contract; in other words, you are only appropriating this year \$9,077,000 against \$12,000,000 last year.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman must remember that with last year's items we included a similar amount for authorizations made for the year before, and so the gentleman will find one balance against the other.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not it a fact that you have not appropriated one dollar for airplanes this year for the carriers that you put into commission at the end of the year?

Mr. FRENCH. We carried in the bill last year money for the airplanes that we were going to put on them all told. I think we have appropriated for this purpose \$6,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That only bought 150 airplanes and the complement of the carriers is 230 airplanes.

Mr. FRENCH. We have already appropriated for planes for the airplane carriers more money than was originally estimated for all planes and spares that they were to carry. Your committee, however, has come before the House year after year with the thought with respect to airplanes that it is unwise for us to build up to the authorization because of the rapidity of obsolescence, the rapidity of waste, the rapidity that attrition is going on, that we would better wait and save our money until the types are standardized and then meet the situation, rather than by appropriating millions of dollars for airplanes that will be eliminated by reason of obsolescence before they are worn out.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well then, as suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas on my right, we had better not build any, because they would soon go out of date.

Mr. FRENCH. The suggestion does an injustice to the sense of fairness of the gentleman. The gentleman knows that there is no logic in it, and that there is a very wide difference between doing nothing on the one extreme, or doing that which amounts to general extravagance, at the other extreme and doing that which is moderate and efficient. The latter is what we are doing. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there, so that I may get this sort of left-handed quotation straightened out?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Here is the idea that I had in mind. I gathered from the gentleman's argument—and if I am incorrect I wish to be corrected—that he takes the position that they were getting out of date, that improvements were so rapid, it was a waste of money to build any of these planes, and that we would better wait until we find out they are perfected. Is that the idea?

Mr. FRENCH. My thought was this. There is rapid improvement going on as to types and as to all the different appliances pertaining to aircraft. We think it better to have a moderate supply of planes on hand, enough to meet the situation during peace times, when we know that the types are likely to be changed, than it is to spend millions of dollars in piling up numbers of planes when before they would be worn out they would be discarded by reason of being obsolete.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman give us some information there, which probably he has. How do we compare in so far as the airplanes that we have for these carriers in numbers with the airplanes in both number and character owned by Japan and Great Britain?

Mr. FRENCH. You can hardly get definite or exact information upon that subject from the Navy Department. We do not know accurately the types that they list as suitable planes, what ones, for instance, are obsolete, what are obsolescent, what ones are ready for service. Last June, on the 15th, I think it was, the Navy Department classified as obsolete something like 300 planes, which the day before had been listed as first-class fighting planes of the Aviation Service of the Navy.

A gentleman in the Japanese Diet would have picked up reports of this country and would have seen that we had nearly 700 fighting planes, if he had looked at the report on June 15, whereas if he had picked up the report dated the next day he would have found that we had less than 400 fighting planes. It is quite impossible to obtain accurate information.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman give me his judgment, and I am not asking this in any controversial spirit, but taking everything into consideration in aircraft, does our Navy compare favorably with that of either Japan or Great Britain?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I think so. I think it goes beyond. The fact of the matter is, as I said a while ago, touching Great Britain, we have aircraft on all of our cruisers, on all of our battleships, while Great Britain has catapults on only one. Great Britain has a united air service and we have not. Great Britain has a greater tonnage in carriers; but I venture the belief that we have made greater gains by holding back, so that the carriers we will build will be up to date as soon as they may be built.

Mr. BLACK of New York. But suppose the British build a few new ones also?

Mr. FRENCH. She can build from 104,000 tons up to 135,000 tons, and she could not build very many big airplane carriers with that tonnage.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. In reference to the question of cruisers, the gentleman was in the group that went to the

Canal Zone at the maneuvers four years ago this spring. It was apparent that we were deficient in a certain type of scout cruiser. In December, 1924, Congress authorized eight scout cruisers. Of those, how many have been completed, are commissioned and in service?

Mr. FRENCH. I think the gentleman is familiar with the program of building. We have appropriated for five of them. Two of them are being built at this time. Three others will likely be begun within six months either by contract or else by building within the navy yards. We are carrying in this bill for those ships, the first two to which I referred, for hull and machinery, \$6,250,000, and for ordnance, \$4,500,000. For the three to which I refer we are carrying \$9,750,000 for hull and machinery, and for ordnance, \$4,500,000.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Of the eight that Congress authorized constructed in December of 1924, we are really now building only two.

Mr. FRENCH. We are building two.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And in this bill for the first time you are reporting to the House an appropriation for the commencement of the building of three of them?

Mr. FRENCH. No. We made an appropriation a year ago that was the initial appropriation, about \$1,200,000. Plans are now made. The department felt that an economy could be effected by combining the appropriation balances for the current year with the amount they are recommending for the next year, and either through contract or through their own navy yards carry on the work from the latter part of this fiscal year and through all of next.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then there remain three of these cruisers that have not been appropriated for and for which no provision whatever is made in this bill.

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Under the authorization, when does the authority expire?

Mr. FRENCH. The authority expires July 1, next. May I say, however, that the President in his message recommended an extension of time for beginning these cruisers.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then the fact remains just the same as it was in 1924, when the maneuvers were over, and the judgment of the experts was that we needed these cruisers, and yet here we have only two of them upon which any considerable amount of work has been done and three for which no appropriation has been made with the authorization about to expire. I ask the gentleman frankly whether he thinks, after Congress has taken action of this kind, based upon the best advice available to us, that the authorization to Congress ought to be ignored in this fashion?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, the Congress has within its control the power to increase and to modify, to make additional allotments to build, or to strike out items that the committee has recommended. We simply use our judgment in preparing the bill and bringing it before the House. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Referring again to this act of December, 1924, section 4 says that in the event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments the President is empowered to suspend in whole or in part any of this building program. Of course, there has been no such conference. I have always had the feeling myself that under an authorization, when Congress announces a policy, that policy ought to be pretty fairly carried out by the Budget and by the Committee on Appropriations. The condition as to suspension of the building in section 4 has not been met.

It seems to me that we are in a position of keeping our Navy short of vessels which the best military and naval advice say we must have.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am anxious to conclude my remarks.

Mr. McKEOWN. Did the persons who sat in at this disarmament conference have the benefit of the expert naval advice when they came to the question of scrapping our ships?

Mr. FRENCH. I have not the slightest doubt, my good friend, that the experts from the department were closely associated with all the actions of that conference, and because of that I have faith in the equity of the conclusions that were arrived at when the treaty was made.

Mr. McKEOWN. If that is true, they must have determined or found that the American Navy at that time was as good as or superior to any of the other navies; otherwise why would they have scrapped 300,000,000 tons of good ships on the ways and have left these old obsolescent ships that they talk about to be scrapped later on?

Mr. FRENCH. Unquestionably the representatives of our country on the whole balanced the Navy of the United States

with the navy of Great Britain and in ratio with the navies of other countries.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKS. The purpose of the disarmament conference was to agree upon some plan for abandoning the perfectly senseless race for naval supremacy, was it not?

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. SPEAKS. The object planned in that conference was to place a limitation upon the number of vessels and also the tonnage. Is that correct?

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. SPEAKS. No limitations were placed with respect to decreasing armaments. In other words, any nation could abandon all naval activities if it so desired?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. I would like to know from the gentleman whether or not all the nations who signed the disarmament treaty have fulfilled in every respect the obligations they entered into on that occasion?

Mr. FRENCH. The subcommittee raised that question when the officers of the Navy Department were before us, and we have been uniformly advised that, so far as our officers of our Government know, the obligations assumed by other countries are being scrupulously adhered to.

Mr. SPEAKS. Then, so far as the results of the disarmament conference are concerned, the plan is working admirably, and the only difficulty we are having now relates largely to the number of aircraft, a few cruisers, and the enlisted and commissioned personnel?

Mr. FRENCH. Not quite. There are some types of ships that the armament agreement did not reach, and as to those types we ought to have a still further conference before we act on a basis where we can say it is one that all nations will respect as they would respect a treaty agreement.

Mr. SPEAKS. One more question, if you please. Germany has no navy at the present time, has she?

Mr. FRENCH. That is about right.

Mr. SPEAKS. Is Germany in any particular danger because she lacks a navy? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman has stated, as I understand, that this, in the main, is an administration bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Generally speaking, we have followed the recommendations in the bill reported by the Budget.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand, laying minor questions, such as the personnel question, aside, we have two major questions here which represent the difference between the administration and those who disagree with the administration, namely, with respect to appropriations for and completing the 1924 cruiser program. That is one issue, and the other is appropriating for the construction of a dirigible. That is the second issue. Those two issues comprise really the case that is before the House and the case on which we have to pass?

Mr. FRENCH. That is as I understand it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There has been very much talk in and out of Congress about the great number of submarines which Japan has. I was surprised to see the statement that while we had 50, Japan had only 42. May I ask the gentleman as to the correctness of that and the source of information?

Mr. FRENCH. All the facts I have given come from the Navy Department.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. So that Japan has only 42?

Mr. FRENCH. Japan has 6 fleet submarines built and 43 submarines of the first line.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand it is impossible for one of the airplane carriers to take the sea until a channel is dredged to let her out. Who is responsible for that?

Mr. FRENCH. The chairman of the subcommittee does not understand that that situation exists.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The fact is that \$3,500,000 is necessary to complete those two carriers. Is that correct?

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. When we appropriate to complete them it will be the third time that we have raised the limit of cost.

What is happening to make all these appropriations necessary?

Mr. FRENCH. The cost-plus principle that was adopted some years ago as to those ships is the factor that is responsible.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Let me ask the gentleman this question: I notice you ask 3,500 more marines than the number suggested by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. FRENCH. Twelve hundred more.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is that because we are intervening in Nicaragua and other countries where we have no business to intervene?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no. I explained to the House a while ago that since the Budget estimates came to the Congress a situation arose that drew upon the marines of our country to protect the mails. We have withdrawn 2,500 of the marines from Quantico and San Diego for that purpose; the result is that the situation has been so modified that we did not feel we would be justified in reducing the personnel at this time. So for the time being and until the situation clears we recommend the regular enrollment of the marines that we are carrying to-day.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I suggest that without any embarrassment to anyone we could withdraw a few from Nicaragua.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The committee in its report at the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress stated that it recommended appropriating for the three additional cruisers authorized by the 1924 act, but in view of the fact that there was another regular session coming before the termination of the authority, to wit, this session, you would not go ahead and appropriate at the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. I call your attention to the fact that when you made that statement with regard to these three extra cruisers there was a disarmament conference pending. Since then that conference at Geneva has proven a failure, and it seems to me that if we needed them before the meeting of that disarmament conference, and which disarmament conference has completely fallen down, certainly we need them now. What has caused the committee to change its mind?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman knows that when we reported the bill at that time the conference had not even met.

Mr. BLACK of New York. But it was in contemplation.

Mr. FRENCH. It was in contemplation, yes; and the President has been authorized to stop at any time the building construction work contained in any program that was on the way. Now, then, following that time the conference did go into session; it continued its session until in September of last year; an adjournment was had until next March or April, and now, during the recess of that conference, it is judged by the administration that the best thing to do is not to make an appropriation for new cruisers.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman answer this question? Is that the thought of the committee, the thought of the General Board and other naval experts, or are we getting our orders from the administration?

Mr. FRENCH. On the question of international policy, I believe we ought to follow the policy recommended by the head of our administration, the one charged with the responsibility of the international relationships of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK of New York. I will say to the gentleman that this Congress is charged with the responsibility of protecting this country, and this Congress and this committee know that they are not ready and not willing to protect the country by an adequate naval defense. I have that from the report of the committee, made at the first session, and all we have against that is the hypothetical proposition that there may be a successful disarmament conference. We have found already that the disarmament conference was a failure, and we can not afford to saddle the responsibility on the Executive and escape our responsibility. The responsibility is primarily ours and goes back intimately to the action of this committee, and when this committee reported at the first session of this Congress that we needed cruisers, so much the more should this committee report at this time that we need cruisers.

Mr. UPDIKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. UPDIKE. The program of 1924 authorized the construction of eight cruisers, and two of them, I understand, are under construction at this time.

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. UPDIKE. Will the gentleman tell the House how much has been done with reference to the construction of these two cruisers and how long it will take to finish them?

Mr. FRENCH. As to those first two, there will need to be an additional appropriation of \$8,250,000 to complete, and it is supposed they will be completed July 9, 1929.

Mr. UPDIKE. Does the gentleman know whether or not the keels of both of these ships have been laid down? Is it not a fact that the keel of only one of these ships has been laid down?

Mr. FRENCH. One of these cruisers is about to be laid down; all material is ready. The other was laid down in October last.

Mr. UPDIKE. I wanted to get the matter clear in my mind.

Mr. FRENCH. I want to thank the House for its very generous attention. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, in view of the chart which the gentleman from Idaho has used in his very able presentation of the viewpoint of the subcommittee, I deem it necessary to make some statements about what took place at the Washington conference in 1922 and what has taken place since the Washington conference. When this conference assembled in 1922, as everyone knows, this Government had in process of being built and in commission at that time one of the greatest navies in the history of the world. As a result of that conference, we took out of the battleship line 17 battleships that were in actual commission. In addition to that, we took out 2 ships that were classified as obsolete, making 19 ships. In addition to that, we had in the process of being built 7 battleships and 6 battle cruisers, for which we had appropriated over \$350,000,000, and they were anywhere from 35 to 45 per cent completed. The tonnage of the ships we took out of commission and which were carried as obsolete amounted to 289,580 tons. The tonnage that was in process of being built amounted to 552,800 tons. So as a result of that conference—and let everyone remember this—we agreed to scrap and have scrapped 32 ships having a total tonnage of 842,380 tons. That, Members of the House, was our contribution to a more lasting peace and to aid in the reduction of competitive armaments among the nations of the world.

Now, let us see what England agreed to do and what England did. England took out of commission 4 ships. She had 18 ships that she carried as obsolete. She therefore offered as her contribution 22 ships. Let this fact be impressed upon your minds, that of these 22 ships only 4 of them were in commission and had men upon them.

Eighteen of them were obsolete, carried as obsolete by the British Admiralty, and of her 22 ships their tonnage was 447,750 tons. She had at that time no ships in process of being built.

Now, let us see what Japan's contribution was. Japan agreed to scrap and to take out of commission 12 ships of a total tonnage of 192,750 tons. She had in process of being built 4 ships, which she also agreed to scrap, of a total tonnage of 161,958 tons. Japan's total contribution in the interest of a more lasting peace was 16 capital ships of a total tonnage of 354,709 tons.

Now, France and Italy—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the gentleman leaves Japan, will he permit me to ask a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With much pleasure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did not the conference provide an exception as respects Japan in the particular of giving to her the right to complete the construction of the largest battleship in the world?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not like to disturb the gentleman, but I did not want you to leave Japan without that fact appearing.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. At that conference two other nations, France and Italy, signatories to the treaty, had no ships in process of being built, and agreed to scrap no ships.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the contribution that each nation that entered into the Washington conference made.

As a result of the conference, let us see what happened: The United States had left 18 battleships of a total tonnage of 552,850 tons. The British Empire, after she has put in commission the *Nelson* and the *Rodney*, that took the place of the four ships that she took out of commission and scrapped as a result of the Washington conference, will have 20 capital ships of a total tonnage of 558,950 tons. Japan, after she has scrapped her 16 ships, has 10 capital ships of a total tonnage of 301,320 tons; and by 1941 Japan, under the ratio of 5-5-3, is entitled to a total tonnage of 315,000 tons. France has 9 capital ships with a total tonnage of 194,544 tons, and Italy 7 capital ships with a total tonnage of 133,670 tons.

This is the strength of the navies that engaged in the treaty as a result of the Washington conference.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. And among the 18 battleships that we kept there were 6 that were coal burners and lacking in gun range in comparison with the British and the Japanese ships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. I will state to the gentleman from Louisiana that six of the ships we kept, in my opinion, should have been included in those that were scrapped, and we should have retained some of the large battleships we were building which were, in turn, scrapped. We have spent over \$22,000,000 in reconditioning the six old battleships that should have been scrapped, and our committee today is conducting hearings to determine whether or not it is economical to spend \$12,000,000 more to recondition two of the ships kept, the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada*.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for another question, and then I shall not disturb him further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Did I understand the gentleman from Idaho to say a while ago that at this international conference on the limitation of armament our representatives did not consult the Navy experts?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, the gentleman from Idaho had so many figures and said so much that you can not prove by me much about what the gentleman from Idaho said.

Mr. LAZARO. I understood him to say that.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is it not a fact that Admiral Coontz was assigned to the disarmament conference?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and Secretary Hughes—

Mr. McCLINTIC. And the Navy was represented there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. But the Navy plans were not carried out there.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I would hate to think that our naval experts originated this idea that ultimately was written into the treaty.

Mr. LAZARO. You would not think they would be that simple.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Out of our 18 capital ships we have only 14 ships armed with guns of over 13 inches. Of the British Navy every ship of her 20 is armed with guns of either 13 or over 13 inches, and every ship of the Japanese Navy is armed with guns of either 13 inches or more.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman means capital ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Capital ships; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. "The object and purpose of the conference was to reduce"—and I am quoting—"the burden of competition among the nations that agreed to the conference."

There was no limitation agreed to in reference to auxiliary craft, and there was a limitation agreed to on cruisers of 10,000 tons. No agreement was reached in reference to destroyers, submarines, and such like.

It is highly important to ascertain what this Nation, as well as other nations—and this is what I want to impress upon you—has built, authorized, and appropriated for since the Washington conference.

Let us see what we have done. Let us see about our contribution toward a further reduction of naval armament. The United States since 1922 has laid down two airplane carriers, two light modern cruisers of the first line, three submarines of all classes, six gunboats, and, in addition to those laid down, we have appropriated for three light modern cruisers, making a total of 16 ships of war that we have laid down and appropriated for since the Washington conference, or a total tonnage of 120,909.

Let us see what Great Britain has done. Great Britain has laid down—and by laying down I mean actually being built—two battleships of 35,000 tons each, the *Rodney* and the *Nelson*, that took the place of the four old ships that she took out of commission or that she got rid of.

Great Britain got rid of her old ships, but we kept our old ships and appropriated \$22,000,000 to repair and make them serviceable. In addition to that, Great Britain has laid down 2 airplane carriers, first line, the *Courageous* and the *Glorious*; 11 light modern cruisers, first line; 1 cruiser mine layer, 2 destroyers, 4 submarines of all classes, 4 gunboats. In addition to those laid down, she has appropriated for 3 modern cruisers first line, 6 submarines, 1 submarine tender, 1 supply ship. Great Britain since 1922 has either laid down or appropriated for 37 ships of war of a total tonnage of 285,795.

Bear in mind that the object and purpose of the conference was to reduce competition in naval armament. Now, let us see what Japan has done.

Japan has laid down 2 aircraft carriers, first line, the *Akagi* and *Koyo*; 12 light modern cruisers, first line; 35 destroyers, 30 submarines of all classes, 4 gunboats, 6 mine sweepers, 2 submarine tenders, 3 tankers, and 1 supply ship.

In addition to what she has laid down she has appropriated for 4 destroyer leaders, 8 destroyers, 9 submarines. Since the Washington conference, which was contemplated to reduce competition in naval armament, Japan has laid down and appropriated for 116 ships of war of a total tonnage of 339,201.

Now, let us see what France has contributed toward reduction of naval armament. France has laid down 1 aircraft carrier, first line; 6 modern cruisers, first line; 1 cruiser mine layer, 6 destroyer leaders, 21 destroyers, 28 submarines, 1 submarine tender, 1 tanker, and has appropriated for 1 modern light cruiser, first line; 3 destroyer leaders, 4 destroyers, 11 submarines, 1 gunboat, 1 submarine tender, 2 tankers. That is a total of 88 ships of war, with a total tonnage of 221,828.

Italy has laid down 2 light modern cruisers, first line; 16 destroyers, 13 submarines, 9 mine sweepers, 4 tankers, 2 supply ships. She has none appropriated for, making a total of 46 ships of war. Italy has laid down since the Washington conference a total tonnage of 102,207 tons. By the act of December, 1924, Congress authorized the building of eight scout cruisers within treaty limit—that is, not over 10,000 tons—and with guns not larger than 8 inches.

Now let us see the status of the nations with reference to their strength in modern cruisers. The United States has 10 modern cruisers classified as scout cruisers under 15 years of age, ranging in tonnage from 3,000 to 10,000 tons. The total tonnage of these ships is 75,000 tons. We are building two of 10,000 tons each and have appropriated for three of 10,000 tons each, making a total for the United States of 15 scout cruisers of 125,000 tons.

Bear in mind that the contracts have not been let for three that we have appropriated for, and, if my memory serves me correctly, there has been only an appropriation of \$1,200,000 for the commencement of the three, but when they have been finished—and no one can tell when that will be at the rate we are now going—we will have, as I have above stated, 15 of a total tonnage of 125,000 tons.

The British Empire has 40, ranging in tonnage from 3,000 to 10,000, and within 15 years of age. Their total tonnage is 194,290 tons, and in addition to those she is building 11 of a total tonnage of 110,200 tons and has appropriated for three of 28,000 tons, making a total for the British Empire of 54 scout cruisers of a tonnage of 332,290 tons.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman a moment ago referred to the 10 light cruisers of the United States as ranging from 3,000 to 10,000 tons. Is it not correct to state that the 10 are 7,500 tons?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. FRENCH. The point is this: The inference might be drawn from what the gentleman said that there are some of 3,000 tons, and in view of that fact the gentleman would not want that inference left.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; I am showing that the 54 scout cruisers of Great Britain are from 3,000 to 10,000 tons, with 3 to 8 inch guns and within 15 years of age. That is the same comparison I have made with reference to ours.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Many of those cruisers of Great Britain are below 5,000 tons. In fact, most of them are below 5,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may be true.

Mr. FRENCH. It is true; while, on the other hand, not one of the 15 American cruisers to which the gentleman has referred is below 7,500 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I stated the comparison was between 3,000 and 10,000 tons. Of course, some of Great Britain's may be fifty-five hundred tons or sixty-five hundred tons. Our 10 are 7,500 tons each.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The gentleman from Idaho evidently thinks that the 10 cruisers authorized on paper can lick these small British cruisers.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. I still think the gentleman does not want to leave an unfair impression to be drawn from his statement.

He has mentioned 15 cruisers, either built or building, or appropriated for by the United States, and he says that they are in a class from 3,000 tons to 10,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not that correct?

Mr. FRENCH. No, it is not; and when the gentleman leaves that inference he is wrong, because, as a matter of fact, 10 of them are 7,500 tons each, and the other 5 are 10,000 tons each, and not one of them is below 7,500 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. The gentleman is correct and so am I, in the way I am expressing it. I am expressing it exactly like the Navy Department expressed it to the gentleman when it sent a statement of comparison of cruisers of these different nations.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman might just as well say that the cruisers are in tonnage from 1,000 to 10,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I say that they are from 3,000 on up.

Mr. FRENCH. While there is not one of less than 7,500 tons.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, let me employ my friend's analytical mind for a few moments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Mr. BUTLER. The country knows, and knows it well, that in 1931 we can not have more than 125,000 tons of these cruisers, as against 332,290 tons of Great Britain's. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. BUTLER. Ten of our cruisers certainly have 7,500 tons each, and nobody denies that; but do not let us quibble. We want some more, and we need them if we are going to compete with these other people. Let me suggest one other thing. Will the gentleman please say to this House what the English propose to do within the next four years?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman that information?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Build 78,000 tons more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that the Limitation of Armament Conference that met in Washington made the limitation applicable to capital ships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Only.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And scout cruisers to an extent of 10,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The limitation was upon the tonnage of cruisers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And not upon the number.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not know that that had appeared. Therefore, so far as the limitation of armament is concerned, the gates are wholly down as to the number of cruisers and all auxiliary craft.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Absolutely.

Mr. WINGO. Before the gentleman leaves that portion of his remarks will he yield to me?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Whatever may be true about the dispute in respect to the tonnage of the individual ships, at the present time our tonnage is 75,000, and the tonnage of Great Britain 194,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Actually built. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WINGO. Physical limitations are such that by 1931 we will have 125,000 tons and Great Britain will have over 400,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. She will have 332,290 tons.

Mr. BLACK of New York. We will not have 125,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We will if we get the money.

Mr. BLACK of New York. But not this way.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Great Britain has 40, ranging from 3,000 tons to 10,000 tons each within 15 years of age, and they are armed with from 3 to 8 inch guns, and my distinguished friend my Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] can tell how many torpedo tubes they have.

Mr. BUTLER. Twelve on each one, of 21 inches.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The total tonnage is 194,290, and in addition to what she has already built, she is building 11 with a total tonnage of 110,000, and has appropriated for 3 with a total tonnage of 28,000; making a total for the British Empire of 54 scout cruisers of 332,290 tons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Idaho give me 15 minutes on this side?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to yield those 15 minutes to my friend from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not do that.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Would the gentleman mind going back to the battleships for a moment to answer this question. Congress appropriated money to convert these six battleships from coal burners to oil burners, and elevate the guns so as to increase the range.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not true that this money was returned to the Treasury?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The money for elevating the guns was returned. The money for converting from coal to oil burners was utilized, and they expended for deck protection, submarine protection, on these six ships \$22,000,000.

Mr. LAZARO. Why can we not elevate the guns?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope we will be able to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. We will do it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let us see about Japan's strength. In reference to cruisers Japan has 19 scout cruisers from 3,000 tons to 10,000 tons each within 15 years of age, the total tonnage being 102,005. In addition thereto she is building 6 with a total tonnage of 54,200, and she has none authorized or appropriated for; making a total for Japan in modern cruisers of 25, with a total tonnage of 156,205.

France has built three with a total tonnage of 16,731 and is building six with a total tonnage of 53,619, and has appropriated for one, making 10 scout cruisers in all, with a total tonnage of 80,350.

Italy has eight with a total tonnage of 30,780 and is building two of 20,000 tons and has appropriated for none; a total of 10 scout cruisers with a total tonnage of 50,780 tons.

Now, members of the committee, in conclusion, the object and the purpose, as I have stated repeatedly, of the Washington disarmament conference was to contribute to the maintenance of general peace and to reduce the burden of competition among nations. Since the conference we have built or appropriated for 16 ships of war. The British have built or appropriated for 37 ships of war. Japan has built or appropriated for 116 ships of war. France has built or appropriated for 88 ships of war and Italy has built or appropriated for 46 ships of war.

The United States scrapped 842,380 tons, and we have appropriated for and rebuilt since the conference 120,909 tons. The British Empire scrapped 447,750 tons, and since the conference she has built and appropriated for 285,795 tons, or within 161,955 tons as much as she has scrapped. Japan scrapped 354,709 tons, and she has built or appropriated for since the conference 330,201 tons, or replaced within 15,508 tons of what she scrapped as a result of the Washington conference. France did not scrap any ships, but since the conference she has added to her naval strength 221,828 tons. Neither did Italy scrap any ships. As a result she, too, has added to her navy 102,207 tons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is for Congress to determine what our policy shall be. It is for Congress to determine whether or not we shall continue to let our Navy stand in the position it is in while other navies are being built within the rights of the treaty. That is the question as stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore]. That is one of the main questions in issue for Congress to determine. At the proper time amendments will be offered and the Members will have an opportunity to express their views as to what the Nation's policy shall be. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. My time has expired.

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. SPEAKS. The gentleman states that at the time of the disarmament conference we were engaged in a building program which, if completed, would have made our Navy the greatest in the world.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. And that we scrapped about 846,000 tons as the result of that conference. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. Had the original building program been completed, and had we not scrapped the 846,000 tons, would not our Navy have been approximately double the strength it has to-day?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. SPEAKS. We are asking in this bill for \$316,000,000. Is the gentleman bewailing the fact that we are not appropriating \$632,000,000 instead of \$316,000,000? In other words, it would seem conclusive that the disarmament treaty restricting naval construction and the scrapping of a large amount of tonnage will this year save the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The gentleman is not bewailing the fact. He has been endeavoring to enlighten the House as to what a complete failure the Washington disarmament conference was.

Mr. SPEAKS. I do not understand how the gentleman reaches the conclusion that the Washington disarmament conference was a failure, in view of the facts and figures presented in his statement and which seem to establish conclusively that our expenditures for naval purposes have been greatly reduced without impairing efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a rather strange thing happened on the floor to-day. We had a confession from the chairman of an important committee of this House that in spite of the fact that his committee has hitherto recommended the construction of three additional cruisers, and the General Board of the Navy, the experts of the Navy, had recommended it, yet in view of the administration policy in international affairs they are not going ahead. A strange admission as to the administration and international policy. It is a question that redounds upon us through our responsibility under the Constitution for 100 per cent protection to the American people.

I always like to listen to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. French] in debate, and in a cause he is an ideal witness, a great evader. He said we could not go ahead with aircraft carriers, in spite of the fact that the British have seven instead of our three, because we have not the last word in aircraft. What a ridiculous statement! What country has the last word in the matter of defensive armament? On the same theory as that which the gentleman seems to have adopted, we ought not to have a Congress until we can have a Congress composed of men of perfect intellectual faculties like those of Woodrow Wilson.

He also said in some cases we have a better average tonnage.

That is not the question. The question is, Are we in the aggregate equal to Great Britain? Great Britain will not make an arrangement with us in case she goes to war to the effect that she will use only her little ships against our big ones. Remember what Balfour did to us in the conference. Anyway, do not send Hughes to make the deal. The whole proposition, as stated by the gentleman from Idaho in his legendarium argument and as indicated by the chart that was before us, is ridiculous. What we want in this country is an adequate Navy, a Navy as far up to 5-5-3 ratio as we can get. We ought to have it all the way up. If it is a good general proposition, let us look up to it. If the other nations are sincere in their preachments about disarmament, let them cut down their cruisers. Let them cut down their submarines, and let them cut down their aircraft carriers to the 5-5-3 ratio.

The whole proposition of that 5-5-3 ratio was a general naval proposition, and when our people walked out of that conference, having scrapped our battleships, then our people did serious damage to American citizens. It is up to us to relieve that damage. Even Secretary Hughes recognized that. He said after the conference:

It is essential that we should maintain the naval strength of the United States.

But our chairman says, with his heart in his voice:

The British would starve if they did not have great ships.

If we are going to have a war with Great Britain, will we send them food and organize relief expeditions to supply them with ammunition, and are we going to give them ships?

Are we going to appropriate funds to give them ships? That is the brutality of war and that is the chance of war. If the British must starve because they have only a fair navy as compared with our Navy, so much the better in case of war with us. I would rather see the British starve than have the people in my district bombarded, and I am sure the people on the California coast would feel the same way about it.

Then about our forts. You would think we had forts with which to protect our coasts, but General Taylor, chief of the Army Engineers, has said that our harbor defenses are obsolete. In view of that we must build up the Navy.

This to me resolves itself into a simple question. It is just a question of cheap politics. That is all it is. The gentleman from Idaho said in response to a question of mine that he would follow the head of the Nation on this question. So far as I am concerned, I would cut off the head of the Nation on this question, because I think the head of the Nation has fallen down flatly in his duty to the American people. I think, moreover, he knows it if he has seen the report of the General Board and of the War College. In this bill the House will decide whether Congress considers the political future of Calvin Coolidge of more consequence than the safety of the Republic. The committee seems willing to gamble this Nation, whose wealth is four hundred billions, or 40 per cent of the total wealth of the world, against an expenditure of \$100,000,000, so that our one-issue President may prate about economy as he burns up the country's money on the naval unit he cherishes, the luxurious *Mayflower*. He knows that we have no 5-5-3 ratio in cruisers or submarines. He knows that our cruiser ratio is to Great Britain as 2 is to 5, and as to Japan in fleet submarines as 3 is to 6. I wonder how he would like to go into the Republican National Convention on the short side of such ratios against Longworth or Lowden? Yet he wants our naval men in the battle of guns to be inferior to the British or the Japs. Self-preservation has been the first law of nature, and King Cal, the chemist, has always observed it. If it is good enough for him, it is good enough for the rest of the country. He has changed the old naval slogan of "Don't give up the ship," to "Don't budge the Budget." The question is not what we can afford, but what do we need for protection? Pacifism for ideals is dangerous, but respectable pacifism for politics is dangerous and despicable. Like he assumes the dual personality of President and official spokesman he now wants the Navy reinforced by a paper navy.

The chairman of the subcommittee says we will have additional protection through the Coast Guard—the dry navy—in case we should have war. Nobody here really knows just what the situation is in the Navy, and that is what we want to find out to-day. It was shown that we do not know what the situation is during the debate between the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. There is a lot of confusion about it; we have got to admit it, and we must get at the facts. We must report to the people, and we must protect the country.

I have a resolution pending in the Rules Committee requiring the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the Committee on Naval Affairs to join as one committee and to summon the officers of the War College before it in order to find out just what is the situation in regard to our relative naval strength. The Washington Post last Monday, in a very strong editorial, says that is the only way you will be able to secure full information as to this naval question.

I have a letter here from a distinguished naval critic, not a British critic, and he writes me to this effect:

WASHINGTON, January 2, 1927.
Congressman BLACK,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLACK: In your resolution (H. Res. 338) in the House of Representatives, December 15, 1926, I find the words, "to permit the use of the Navy Department, including the facilities of the Naval War College at Newport."

There has been, and is, a great diversity of opinions outside the Navy Department and the Naval War College on the interpretation of the 5-5-3 ratio and what constitutes national defense.

It is obvious that the heads of the United States Government, the United States Senate, and the House of Representatives have either been not informed, misinformed, or have neglected to look thoroughly into the status of our naval defenses and comparisons with other naval signatory powers of the Washington arms treaty.

Chairman BUTLER, House Naval Affairs Committee, makes a brave and honest confession that America had been fooled and he had been deluded. That is evident in the fact that the four signatory naval powers have increased tons and guns while the United States Navy has decreased.

There is no longer any doubt that the letter and spirit of the Washington arms treaty has been violated. The Washington arms treaty as understood and pledged is equal with Great Britain and 5-3 over Japan. This was understood in 1922, when the Secretary of the Navy directed the General Board to formulate a United States naval policy. The complete work, which was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, concludes that the balanced fleet for the United States Navy requires:

1. Eighteen battleships, all maintained in the highest state of efficiency. This necessitates in the cases of some of them: (a) An increase in the elevation of guns; (b) a change from coal fuel to oil fuel; (c) increased protection against torpedoes and bombs.

2. Sixty modern light cruisers. In order that our strength in this respect may equal that of Great Britain and be superior to that of Japan in the ratio of 5 to 3, there should be authorized a building program of 50 new vessels, 10 of which should be laid down each year for the next five years.

3. Two hundred and seventy destroyers, our present number. As all of these vessels are the same age, and, in consequence, become obsolete at practically the same time, a replacement program should be immediately initiated.

Right here, parenthetically, the gentleman from Idaho says the reason we do not need so many sailors is because, while we have a great number of ships for comparison purposes, we have a great number out of commission.

4. Fifteen destroyer leaders. There are no vessels of this type in the fleet. All of them should be provided for at once.

5. One hundred and ten modern, effective submarines. In order to obtain this number, a building program of 45 new vessels is necessary. All new submarines should be capable of operating as a part of and with the fleet.

6. Five first-line airplane carriers. There are two under construction. Three additional should be laid down as soon as practicable.

I want to point out that the chairman of the subcommittee neglected to say that Australia is building an airplane carrier that is chargeable to the British quota.

7. Six lighter-than-air ships. As the *Los Angeles* is only for commercial purposes, provision should be made to augment the *Shenandoah* by five new dirigibles.

This is an old report and was made prior to the ill fate of the *Shenandoah*.

8. Sufficient train vessels to insure the efficient operation of the combatant fleet.

All attempts to place before Congress the exact conditions and requirements of the Navy have been defeated. It is therefore of vital importance to our national security to call on the Naval War College for a complete and impartial report on the ratio of all naval powers, including the United States Navy.

The importance of this, as covered by your resolution, can no longer be ignored in view of the Naval War College findings and opinions, in part as follows:

"The data has not all been compiled, but there is more than enough to show what condition we are in now and how we were sold out at the conference. I can not believe that it was done wittingly, but I do know that we conceded more than we should and more than the board of naval experts recommended as the minimum. * * * It would take too long to go into all the details of the matter, but I will say this: We are hopelessly inferior to Great Britain in capital ship strength—range, rapidity of fire, weight of metal thrown, destructive effect, etc.—and the hell of it is, there is nothing that Congress can do under the treaty that can elevate us from our hopeless inferiority in capital ship strength. Gun elevation will not do it. Blisters will help. Thickness of deck armor will help; but we can not structurally do this. Our 16-inch guns are inferior in fire effect to their 15-inch. What is the answer? Strange as it may seem to one who has not heard the reasons for such a drastic departure in our policy—I often wonder if we have one—the answer is high-speed 10,000-ton cruisers with no armor, unless they have some 5 to 6 inch deck armor, equipped with 8-inch guns. This will give you an inkling as to our condition. * * * P. S.: I have only scratched the surface."

The following table is the result of six problems played or worked out at the War College:

Yards	American (in battle)	Ships sunk	Time (minutes)	British (in battle)	Ships damaged
1. 15,000	18	All	21	22	58
2. 17,000	18	All	27	22	47
3. 23,000	18	All	45	22	18
4. 25,000	5	All	45	13	12
5. 29,000	5	All	75	13	13
6. 30,000	5	All	84	13	11
					Per cent

British gun elevation 20° minimum.
United States 13 ships, 15° maximum.

Table of range of fire British and American

Yards	British ships (firing)	American ships (firing)
15,000	22	18
17,600	22	18
Above—		
21,000	22	12
22,000	22	10
23,000	22	8
24,000	22	5

Ships must fight and fire at given range until one or the other is destroyed. The life of a ship is expressed in number of hits that will render her incapable of further offensive or sink her.

British, American, and Japanese fleets fire most favorable for each fleet to adopt: Japanese, minimum, 25,000 yards; British, minimum, 24,000 yards; American, maximum, 13 ships, 22,000 to 23,000 yards.

The relative strength of the three naval powers as given by Naval Intelligence is—

	Great Britain	United States of America	Japan
Personnel	5	4.2	3.4
Aircraft carriers	5	2.9	2.3
Modern cruisers	5.1	1.5	2.6
Fleet subs	5	3.7	6.9

The United States destroyer strength, on which we may rely, does not exist. The 103 destroyers in commission are the best of that class 10 years old. The destroyers out of commission are deteriorating rapidly, all equipment must be replaced. It would take at least three years to repair and equip those ships and train 1,200 officers and 22,000 men, the number required for that service.

The ratio for destroyer leaders is:

Great Britain	5
United States of America	0
Japan	?

A further letter from the Naval War College, in part, as follows: "The American fleet is shown to be weak to a point of serious and alarming degree, not being backed up by reserves, auxiliaries, supplies, fuel, and a lack of policy and preparedness. The War College problems that were played show that we can not handle a battle fleet on the Pacific. Lack of bases, fully equipped, were reasons given. Mare Island can only figure as repair yard for light ships. There was no mention of any other base other than Panama. That to handle the battle fleet on the Pacific it will be necessary to dock the capital ships on the Atlantic and use the Panama Canal Zone as operating base, 600 to 700 ships for supplies and fuel would be necessary to guarantee supplies and fuel for the maintenance and operations overseas. There is no base or harbor in the Pacific equipped to accommodate the entire fleet in every respect."

The merchant marine strength of a nation should be considered a part of its navy. Within 30 to 90 days merchant ships can be converted to cruisers and aircraft carriers.

Great Britain can convert 42 merchant ships of 20 knots and over. Added to her five aircraft carriers, this would give the British Navy a plane carrying capacity of 2,500 to 3,000 airplanes, protected by a superior navy of capital ships, light cruisers, and fleet submarines.

There is every evidence that the United States Navy would be defeated in every major engagement.

The second paragraph of the General Board's report defines the "fundamental naval policy of the United States" in the following sentence: "The Navy of the United States should be maintained in sufficient strength to support its policies and its commerce, and to guard its continental and overseas possessions."

Our present naval policy is only to maintain. The building or replacement program gives way to the maintaining of certain almost worthless navy yards, which is not consistent with economy. Nor is Mr. McCarl, General Lord, or Congressman MADDEN qualified or justified to direct what is to be presented to Congress or what constitutes national defense. As to future naval disarmament, Great Britain has officially declared she will never disarm, and, with other signatory powers, has violated the letter and spirit of the Washington arms treaty.

All other naval powers recognize the fact that England can not and will not disarm. And these facts influence and guide the defense policies of all other powers.

Captain Smyth, United States Navy, officially stated "that the other nations were scrambling to construct as many ships 1 ton under the 10,000-ton limits as they can afford, and that each nation is trying to misrepresent others."

Europe and Japan's answer to future peace parleys and their faith in the success of further naval disarmament is demonstrated in Captain Smyth's statement.

America's faith in future naval disarmament is a danger and a delusion, backed up with only a misrepresentation that 5 cruisers are building and a further empty promise that 10 more will be built. This is only a sop to the American people.

I call to your attention the pledge made at Cleveland, "We pledge ourselves to fully maintain the Navy to the treaty ratio." The United States lived up to the treaty ratio in scrapping, but at no time have we made an attempt to live up to the building ratio. Our honor and duty are as much pledged one way as the other.

If the naval ratio is based on the Washington arms treaty, Great Britain should scrap 39 light cruisers and Japan should scrap 17 light cruisers. If, however, this is not done, the United States will be the only nation that has made real sacrifices under the Washington arms treaty.

The Hon. W. C. Bridgman, First Lord of the British Admiralty, officially stated: "Britain must retain her supremacy of the seas so far as cruisers are concerned," and suggested last July in London the status quo in cruisers.

France and Italy have stated that they will never give up their defense, the submarine. No arms parity at Geneva, or elsewhere, will reduce the superior cruiser strength of Great Britain and Japan to our ratio of 1-5.

If national defense is a nonpartisan issue, why wait until 1928 and risk the security of the Nation by putting the Navy in an irretrievable position?

Further hopes for naval disarmament is not the answer to meet our ratio in cruisers. Such hope is misleading and but a further attempt to crystallize the Harding-Hughes Washington arms pact, and a smoke screen as justification of the Nation voluntarily sacrificing its sea power.

The plea that appropriations at this time might embarrass the League of Nations disarmament plans is a misnomer. The League of Nations, dedicated to a martyr of peace, is desecrated by crafty statesmen, who barter and trade in weaker nations to satisfy the imperialistic policies of the powers. The inner council of the League of Nations is composed of the armed powers; their voice is recognized by their weight of armor; they jealously guard that recognized power of security and openly increase their diplomatic weight by the ever-increasing weapons of war. It is an armed peace by an armed league.

Your resolution, House Resolution 338, offers a sane and constructive means to form a policy of national defense.

The Naval War College and the Board of Strategy are better equipped to work out every plan of offense and defense and place before Congress the actual merit of weapon and class of ship.

To successfully attain the above, it is absolutely necessary to eliminate all political interference and influence. No single political, military, or naval mind is qualified to be the last word in what constitutes national defense.

The greatest influence brought to bear on our naval-defense policies should be the naval strength and naval policies of all other naval powers.

Your resolution offers the way to the Naval War College to submit all data and to demonstrate by problems before the Senate and House Committees on Naval Affairs our actual naval strength. This will bring into the light the unquestionable and indisputable facts.

The time has arrived to fill the gap in our naval weakness. Authorization means nothing without appropriations to build ships, and a policy to save the initiative of the service.

National defense and trade are one in order to guarantee security, peace, and prosperity, which is the shield to the immortality of a nation.

A policy of idealism is not a combative force. It is but the policy of the supergovernment which controls our destiny.

The intent of the Washington arms treaty is based on comparisons with other naval powers. Congress should be guided by those comparisons and relieve any one man, in whose hands rests the security of the Nation, of that great power and responsibility.

Respectfully,

W. B. SHEARER.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to hear the gentleman on the question of when we are going to have some more sinkings of the various ones we have built.

Mr. BLACK of New York. We are not going to bother about that. If we should have a war, the British or the Japs will attend to that for us.

Now, here is where the President honestly stated the position, and this is from his message to Congress under date of December 6, 1923:

For several years we have been decreasing the personnel of the Army and Navy and reducing their power to the danger point.

Further reductions should not be made. The Army is a guaranty of the security of our citizens at home; the Navy is a guaranty of our citizens abroad. Both of these services should be strengthened rather than weakened. Additional planes are needed for the Army and additional submarines for the Navy. The defenses of Panama must be perfected. We want no more competitive armaments. We want no more war. But we want no weakness that invites imposition. A people who neglect their national defense are putting in jeopardy their national honor.

So spoke Calvin Coolidge in 1923 and yet look at what his spokesman on the floor of the House has said to-day about the Navy needs.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am going to turn aside just a little while from this discussion of armament and discuss for a few minutes the situation confronting many of the Representatives and the States that many of us represent here in the matter of the rights of the States to representation in either body of this Congress.

A few days ago, or at least within the last month, it was stated by a distinguished Member of the other body that there were precedents in the House of Representatives for denying a man a seat without his having been sworn in and having had a hearing. There is some precedent, but I want to discuss just a moment what the precedents amount to. A man presents his credentials here or in the Senate of the United States.

I am not discussing Senators, and therefore I have a right to refer to the body. It contains the great seal of the State that the man represents. It imports absolute verity. It is prima facie the right of that man to maintain on the floor of the body he proposes to join his representative capacity of the State from which he comes; and until that presumption is rebutted and rebutted by proof and rebutted under an opportunity to be heard and to have a trial and to be confronted by the witnesses, that man has the right to represent the State whose great seal he bears on his commission.

What are the precedents that were cited as being in the House of Representatives? The most notorious was one from my State, where one Whittemore, a reconstruction carpetbagger, came up here and did acts that were so disgraceful that the House was in the course of expelling him, and did adopt such a resolution after he resigned. The House, having heard him and having determined that he was guilty of conduct that was unbecoming a Representative of the State, he went back, and his constituents immediately reelected him to fill his unexpired term. He came back and presented his commission here and he was not allowed to be seated upon the floor. He was rejected, and as a result never was allowed to take the oath. But this was after the presumption that arises from the bearing of the commission with the great seal of the State upon it had been effectually rebutted and destroyed. He had had his hearing. He was merely here asking this body to overrule the former solemn judgment of this House and allow him to be seated, notwithstanding the infamy he had already placed against his name.

Mr. BOWLING. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOWLING. Did that particular person take the oath before the resolution of expulsion had been adopted?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; he had been serving for a year or more.

Mr. BOWLING. I mean when he came back.

Mr. STEVENSON. No; he was not allowed to take the oath.

Mr. BOWLING. He was not allowed to take the oath?

Mr. STEVENSON. No, sir. That is the precedent referred to, I take it, in the other body. That precedent is not a precedent for denying a Representative of a State the right to take the oath to which he is entitled because of the verity that is found in the great seal of the State that he represents. And so zealous were the people who made the Constitution that they said, "Yes; we will make the House and the Senate the judge of the qualifications of its Members. Yes; we will do that; but before we will allow the will of a State to be overridden or allow a Representative of the State to be declared not a Representative, except where there is a contest, there must be a two-thirds majority of the House finding that he is unfit to sit in the House to which he has been accredited by the seal of the State."

I have thought a great deal about the conditions that are confronting the Senate. I hope that our people will not be stampeded by clamor about primary corruption. Following the Whittemore case Mr. BINGER was expelled from the House.

He was reelected and came and presented his credentials. The very fact he had been expelled resulted in his being denied the right to take the oath. This was in the stress of war. Since that time even that has been waived, and he now sits with us. There was also the Brigham Roberts case, I believe, from Utah, where under the stress of agitation and a religious issue and an issue of polygamy and various other things there was a long investigation, and I believe he was never allowed to take the oath and become a Member of the House; but that should not be regarded as a precedent, because I do not think that was a well-considered judgment. It was one of fear rather than of justice and of law.

I say these things because to my mind those of us who represent conservative constituencies, who have always had great regard for the Constitution, should not sit down idly and let the constitutional provision be swept aside by the passions that may arise out of the scandal that has grown out of a primary election or any other kind of election.

I am not alarmed at the continual intimations that are being made that they will investigate and determine that we are not living up to the fifteenth amendment. We have two classes of people who are throwing bouquets at the South, one wanting us to vote one way for fear they will get after us about the fifteenth amendment, and the other wants us to turn in and nullify the eighteenth amendment, because they say that if we do not they will enforce the fifteenth amendment.

I have no patience with this. The South has always stood for the Constitution. She stood for it and she justified her stand on battle fields that made this country a history that has never been written greater in any history in the world. [Applause.] And, by the way, she stood for it when that which was done in the heat of war had to be cured by constitutional amendments, admitting that she had been standing for her rights and that she had the right to retain them. It took constitutional amendments after the war to cure what had been done during the war.

They talk about the fifteenth amendment! I want to tell you that in South Carolina the Constitution gives any man the right to vote who has \$300 worth of property on the tax books and pays his taxes or who can read the Constitution. There is not a colored man in the State of South Carolina who can not register and vote if he comes within that limitation, and when he does his vote is counted. It is not like what happened up in Massachusetts, in the district of a gentleman who sometimes gets after us down here. A colored man publishes a paper up there, and he sent me an issue of it some time ago in which he charged, and seemed to prove, that a couple of colored men were elected to the legislature up there and they counted them out. They appealed to the legislature, and it sustained the counting out. [Laughter.]

I want to tell you that under the constitution of South Carolina, squaring with the constitutional amendments, I served six years with a colored man in the House of Representatives of South Carolina. Why? Because they had a majority in the county of Georgetown and they had a right to elect. They had that right under the Constitution under which we are operating to-day, and he was elected and he sat in the legislature constantly for six years, and I used to take a great deal of pleasure when gentlemen and ladies from Boston would come in and be brought up and introduced to the Speaker, when I used to be Speaker, and the first question they would ask was, "Which is the Democratic and which is the Republican side." I used to point to this little colored fellow over there and tell them, "That is the Republican side." [Laughter.]

We count them and we give them their rights and they can vote to-day, and we invite anybody who wants to, to come down and see whether we are living up to the fifteenth amendment.

We are trying to live up to the eighteenth amendment, too, and we have no sympathy with this attempt to nullify the Constitution that is being made in some places and the attempt to tie to the Democratic Party the proposition that it is trying to nullify the eighteenth amendment.

Gentlemen, I have digressed a little, but we see this statement every day. The Washington Post has a squib every morning about the southern Members and what would they think if they took a notion to enforce the fifteenth amendment.

The State of South Carolina started out with a colored majority of 40,000. A man was elected governor in 1876, when there was 40,000 majority if they all voted one way, but after Hampton was elected governor, the supreme court, made up of a carpetbagger from New York and a colored man from Philadelphia, decided that he was legally elected. And he was elected by thousands of colored men voting for him. We have just celebrated the semicentennial of his inauguration.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How large a colored population in South Carolina vote to-day?

Mr. STEVENSON. None of them vote. They found out long ago that there was nothing to it for them. They did not get anything out of it. As one of them expressed it, "All they want is to get us to register and get a poll tax out of us. There is nothing in it."

The colored man is a good citizen, but he never finds anything in the organization down there that is fit for him to vote for and I do not blame him for not voting. But that does not suppress him. The State has given him the right to vote when he qualifies and sometimes he qualifies, and then frequently does not vote. They do not vote, but not because they can not vote. They quit sending a man to the legislature from Georgetown 20 years ago. All this talk about danger to white domination in the South is not true. It has gone along until to-day the white people are in the large majority, even in South Carolina, and I hope Mississippi will soon crawl out of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. In South Carolina the white man has to conform to certain regulations in order to vote?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the colored men have to conform to the same regulations, and if they do they can vote?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. He can vote, but he does not want to.

Mr. BLANTON. But if he does want to vote he conforms to the same regulations as the white man does?

Mr. STEVENSON. Absolutely; they are on an absolute equality before the law and under the Constitution.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand that the colored man is protected fully under the Constitution. Is there any moral suasion used there?

Mr. STEVENSON. No, sir; there has not been for 40 years.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand that on election day if a colored man approaches too near the ballot box to vote it changes his complexion?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is like a great many of the understandings of the gentleman from New York. There is nothing to it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; I will.

Mr. BLANTON. There are in the District of Columbia 110,000 colored people. Not one of them is permitted to vote and there has been no effect on the part of our brethren across the aisle to take any steps to allow them to vote. They are disfranchised, every one of that 110,000 colored people. If you want to enfranchise any colored people, why do not you begin in Washington?

Mr. STEVENSON. Now I will conclude what I started out to say. I want to reiterate that in so far as nullifying any clause in the Constitution is concerned the southern people are against it. In so far as enforcing the Constitution is concerned the great majority are in favor of it, and the discussions that are going on from day to day and week to week sometimes make me think that it is an effort to make it appear that we want to nullify certain provisions and certain clauses of the Constitution. The South has stood for the Constitution ever since it was written, ever since the South wrote it, because it did write it and construed it and it is prepared to live up to it now and the gentleman from New York can come down there, put on a wooly wig, black his face, come around to the election booth, and I will guarantee that we will not molest him; but he has got to be registered first.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will they count his vote?

Mr. STEVENSON. No; I do not think they would count his vote, because he would not be a resident. The vote of the colored man is counted in South Carolina the same as anywhere else. As I said 25 years ago, a colored man was elected to the legislature and served for six years, and I served with him. He was elected on a Republican ticket and afterwards they took him out and made him postmaster, but he couldn't be postmaster to-day, because he would not have enough money to pay for it. [Laughter and applause.]

The Civil Service Commission reports, which I just got, shows that a postmaster, a henchman of a boss Republican in South Carolina, sold the village carrier positions in my district last September for \$300 apiece, and got the money. The Civil Service Commission turned them down, and the devil is to pay now as to who is to pay the money back. I do not know that anybody cares whether they ever get it back or

not. The following is their report to me, and I honor them for their manly fight to clean up this nefarious business:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 31, 1926.

Hon. WILLIAM F. STEVENSON, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Following your visit to this office on October 19, 1926, an investigation was made of the charge that candidates had paid to political referees or their agents certain sums of money in return for promises of appointment as village carriers at Clover, S. C.

From the information obtained it is evident that \$600 was paid to Parnell Meehan, postmaster at Chesterfield, S. C., to secure the appointments of James S. Jackson and Robert C. Faulkner. This money was paid in four amounts of \$150 each prior to the date of the examination (September 18, 1926), in which both Jackson and Faulkner received ineligible ratings.

No evidence was secured to show that Daniel M. Barrett or L. C. Dale used or attempted to use money in an effort to receive indorsement for appointments.

A copy of the report of the commission's investigator in this case has been transmitted to the Postmaster General for consideration in connection with the nomination of Mr. Meehan for reappointment.

By direction of the commission.

Very respectfully,

JOHN T. DOYLE, Secretary.

There was a citizen of my town, a native of Vermont, and he was appointed postmaster some years ago. He declined to contribute to the funds of certain pollywogs down there, and when the time came for him to be reappointed they called for an examination. Although he made the highest grade they had another fellow appointed, because he would not come across, and he told me so. That is the reason the colored man does not vote down there. There is nobody for him to vote for who is fit to vote for, and everything is for sale which the machine that is maintained down there in South Carolina has to deliver, and it is sold like beef in the market, and mighty cheap beef at that. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. APPLEBY].

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, and gentlemen, about a year ago in a speech I made on the floor of this House—on the Navy appropriation bill—I called attention to the fact that the British were constructing two 5,000,000 cubic feet lighter-than-air ships. In last session we authorized the construction of two 6,000,000 cubic feet ships in the naval aviation bill, but did not make appropriation for them. Therefore, we have not increased our lighter-than-air ship construction the past year, except for one 200-foot J ship. In the meantime all the other nations are going ahead of us in lighter-than-air construction and we are simply marking time, because the Budget has not asked for funds to commence construction.

The functions of Congress are specifically mentioned in our Constitution, namely, make our laws, authorized for the national defense and make appropriations. It seems in the present form of government one department or a bureau created by an act of Congress is constantly striving to usurp the power vested in Congress by our Constitution and affirmed by our citizens in electing membership to both legislative bodies.

We authorize ships, the number of men to man the ships, by law. The Budget then deliberately goes against the wishes of the majority of the membership of this House recommending, by withholding requests for appropriations, sufficient number of men for our national defense. How long is this going to continue? Is the Budget in the future, a department created by Congress, going to completely usurp the powers vested in this House by the majority of people and confirmed every two years? The members of the Sub-Appropriation Committee deserve a vote of thanks from this Nation for not accepting the Budget's ideas in refusing to cut down enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps.

I would like to call attention to the testimony which appears in the naval appropriation hearing. In a question by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, asked of Admiral Moffett, who is Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy, Mr. OLIVER said:

"I would like to ask about lighter-than-air ships. I assume that you have made an estimate for that, and the Budget did not think it wise to appropriate for it at this time."

To that question Admiral Moffett replied:

"That is right."

The *Los Angeles*, our only lighter-than-air ship, a diagram of which is before you, is of 2,600,000 cubic feet capacity, contains 13 helium cells, was built in Germany, and made a very

successful flight to the United States, and when the ship was moored inside the hangar at Lakehurst, N. J., it was found that she could have completed a trip to Texas without stopping.

Under our treaty with Germany the *Los Angeles* can be only used for a training cruise and not for military purposes. In other words, at the present time we do not have any rigid lighter-than-air ships for military purposes. During the World War the Germans successfully took 20 tons of supplies from Germany to South Africa and return. If we constructed one ship, as authorized by last year's bill, we could carry 70 tons of munitions twice as fast as any vessel that sails the sea over a distance of 6,000 miles. Rapid strides are being made in lighter-than-air construction. Germany has built 126 lighter-than-air ships, and I quote from the *Aviation Magazine*, December 6, 1926, page 964, as follows:

GERMAN SUPERZEPPELIN UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Despatches state that the construction of Germany's new Superzeppelin is progressing rapidly. Dr. Hugo Eckenor, who is supervising the construction, and who will command the ship when it is completed, has partially disclosed the secrets of the new propulsion system which will be installed. According to Doctor Eckenor, the power will be supplied by five 420-horsepower Maybach engines especially designed to burn a fuel known as carbonated hydrogen, with the chemical formula CH_4 . It is claimed this fuel is lighter and more efficient than either gasoline or benzol. This will dispense with the necessity for wasting valuable inflammable gas when ascending to high altitudes. The use of this carbonated hydrogen for fuel will cut down by 35 per cent the weight allowance for fuel.

A lighter-than-air ship depends upon the lifting power of the helium to float it in the air, and the *Los Angeles* is driven by five 400-horsepower motors. It is steered by double rudders and normally the altitude is changed by raising or lowering two flippers or fins, which are at right angles to the double rudders. As a reserve captain in the United States Marine Corps, I was attached to the naval air station at Lakehurst, N. J., last spring and this fall, and was an observer on the U. S. S. *Los Angeles* on several of its flights, and was in a splendid position to acquire first-hand information about our lighter-than-air activities. On one flight from Lakehurst to Newport, R. I., made over the sea, I had an opportunity to watch the operation of the *Los Angeles* mooring to a floating mast mounted on the stern of the U. S. S. *Patoka*. This mooring-mast vessel is the only one of its kind in existence and has demonstrated the feasibility of mooring airships to surface vessels in harbors. I understand England is now trying to imitate this United States adaptation of the mooring mast.

I wish to thank the Committee on Appropriations for not restricting lighter-than-air developments at Lakehurst this year. A very good course of instruction is given in free ballooning, nonrigid airship operation, parachute construction, parachute tests, rigid airships, as well as a landing field for airships heavier than air. A very good arology station is maintained there, and weather reports are transmitted to Langley Field, Anacostia, and Arlington, Va. It is an important link in the chain of stations which furnish the weather information for all aeronautical activity in the United States. Another peace-time measure of lighter-than-air ship is to calibrate compasses from shore station, thus having a check on the accuracy of compasses on shore vessels.

The experience of 45 hours of flight on the *Los Angeles* last year and 11½ hours on our new nonrigid J-3 ship, with service on the rudders of the same, has led me to think it is highly important that money be made immediately available for the commencement of two nonrigid lighter-than-air ships, as provided in the naval aviation bill of last year. At the proper time it is my intention to offer an amendment providing these ships. I trust the amendment will pass. It takes between 30 and 40 months to complete a nonrigid ship, and we can build two at the same time for less money than we can build one. It will not require all the appropriation at one time. Why should we close our eyes to lighter-than-air activities when other nations are going rapidly ahead and copying all our improvements? England did not construct any worth while lighter-than-air ships until London was bombed. George Washington said:

In time of peace, prepare for war.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, it happens that there are a couple of speeches of such length that it was not desired by the ones who were to have the time that they go on to-night.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman stated this morning that he thought it wise to run along a while in general debate without fixing the time when general debate should expire. Have you ever reached any agreement?

Mr. FRENCH. We have not as yet, and I was thinking we would now rise and adjourn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. One other question. About what length of time does the gentleman have in mind to consume in general debate?

Mr. FRENCH. I have requests for less than one hour.

Mr. AYRES. And I suppose I will require less than 30 minutes, so why not agree on the length of general debate this afternoon?

Mr. FRENCH. We can agree early in the morning.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to ask leave to extend my remarks on the question of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee on the very able manner in which he presented this bill this afternoon. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I can not agree with the Budget recommendations regarding the reduction of the personnel of the Marine Corps from 18,000 to 16,800 men. To my mind there are several reasons why this most efficient and useful military organization or establishment should be kept intact. I shall endeavor to give a few. Roughly speaking, the duties of the Marine Corps may be divided, or rather subdivided, into these general classes:

First. Marine detachments serving on board of the fleet.

Second. Guards for navy yards and all naval establishments and activities on shore, at home and abroad.

Third. Administrative and other marine duties.

Fourth. Foreign shore duty in connection with carrying out our national policies.

Fifth. Expeditionary forces under training and available for active service in an emergency, either of peace or war.

Sixth. Aviation.

Taking up the first proposition of marine detachments serving on board of vessels of the fleet. It is this duty which gives the Marine Corps its nautical character, differentiates it from the Army, and makes it especially fitted for duty in support of the fleet in the event of hostilities. Marines on board a ship in addition to doing the military guard duty of the ship, constitute a part of the ship's company and perform many of the same duties as sailors, including the manning of a part of the torpedo-defense battery, and other similar duties I might mention.

Now, referring to the second class of duties, that of guarding navy yards, and so forth. All of the naval yards, naval stations, ammunition depots, and other naval establishments and activities are guarded and protected against fire and thieves by marine detachments.

Calling attention to the third and fourth classes of duties I mentioned a few moments ago, that is administrative and foreign shore duty, for over a hundred years marines have been employed in foreign countries in connection with carrying out our national policies and for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens. At the present time several marine detachments are engaged in carrying out this duty. About 900 are stationed in Haiti; about 500 in Peking, China; and an urgent demand is being made for at least that many more. Additional forces are held on board of ships in the Orient and ashore in the Philippine Islands and Guam in readiness for use in China. There is also a detachment at Guantanamo, Cuba, for use by the special squadron should additional marines be needed by that squadron.

The fifth subdivision mentioned is that of expeditionary forces under training and available for active service in an emergency either of peace or war. A study of the history of the Marine Corps during the period, we will say, since the Spanish-American War, shows that forces of marines of varying size have been employed nearly every year either at home or abroad in connection with our national policies. For instance, about 3,000 marines were landed in Vera Cruz in April, 1914, where they continued to serve as a part of the army of occupation until December of that year, and I might mention many other expeditionary forces of marines used in other foreign countries in like manner. On two occasions it has been called on for use in the emergency caused by the depredations of bandits and robbers of the United States mails. It is at the present time engaged in guarding the mails, about 2,500 men being used for that purpose. These men guard all trucks and

trains carrying valuable mail. They keep guard at stations where mail bags are being unloaded or transferred from mail cars into the station and follow up the transportation of these mail bags to their destination—that is, the post office—and keep guard there when the bags are later taken from the trucks into the post office or from the post office to the trucks, as the case may be.

It is a deplorable condition which exists in some of the larger cities in this country which makes a decent citizen blush with shame to think that the local governments of those cities are so helpless that they can not protect the Federal Government against robbery of the mails it is delivering to the citizens of such cities, but such is the case. These robberies have taken place while mail bags were being moved from the trains to the trucks or just outside of a railroad station; also they have occurred just outside of the post office. As a result marines were called for by the Post Office Department, and while it was somewhat of a commonplace thing to read of a mail robbery before, no one has heard of such a thing since. The marines have taken over the matter of guarding the mails.

Any time Uncle Sam needs policemen to guard him on land or sea, at home or abroad, in times of peace or of war, he knows where to go and get them. He calls for the marines. This has been the case ever since the beginning of this Nation.

It might be interesting to give a brief history of the United States Marine Corps from the date it was created or founded. It was founded on November 10, 1775, by a resolution of the Continental Congress directing the raising of two battalions of marines. These were the first troops authorized by that body. The first marine officer to receive a commission was Capt. Samuel Nicholas on November 28, 1775. During the Revolution these men served as a part of Washington's army in the Battles of Trenton and Princeton and other battles on land. They also had their share in all the victories of Commodore Hopkins and John Paul Jones on sea. At the close of the Revolution the Marine Corps was practically disbanded; but soon thereafter, on July 11, 1798, the Marine Corps was permanently reestablished by act of Congress, approved by the President on that date, and saw action aboard ship almost immediately after its reestablishment during the naval war with France.

The marines saw much service in the War of 1812. The *Constitution* had a marine guard through all her combatant career, and members of that guard took a prominent part in all of her battles. They also shared in the victory of Lake Erie, and the marine guard formed part of our military forces invading Canada in 1813. They took a prominent part in the defense of Baltimore and the Battles of Bladensburg, New Orleans, and many other engagements.

In 1823 the marines formed a part of a landing force which attacked and defeated a nest of pirates in Cuba. Then in 1824 they were called on to suppress a famous mutiny in the Massachusetts State prison. In the years of 1836 and 1837 there were two battalions of marines serving in the war against the Creek and Seminole Indians, and in the war with Mexico the marines fought both on land, as a part of the military forces, and on sea, as a part of the naval forces. They shared in the capture of Vera Cruz on March 29, 1847, and under the command of Colonel Watson joined the forces of General Scott in the march to Mexico City. They took a leading part in the campaign which led to the conquest of California and served in practically all of the engagements during the war with Mexico.

The history of the marines shows that they are always seeing service, not only during war times but in peace times as well. For instance, in 1857 the marines stationed here in Washington were called on to suppress the "plug uglies" riot, and in 1859 they were called out to suppress a distinguished citizen of my own State, John Brown, who was making a raid, and it ended as usual when the marines are called to take a hand.

I shall not take the time to detail the wonderful service rendered by the marines both on land and sea during the Civil War. If I should go into this it would take hours. It is sufficient to say they were found on the firing line at all times and under all conditions and circumstances.

What I am endeavoring to do is to call attention to the diversified duties performed by this organization at all times. The marines have never been idle. Immediately after the close of the Civil War—that is, in 1871—they were called on to capture the Korean Forts because of the hostile action by natives of that country against a naval surveying party. Then in 1873 they were called out to take care of a disturbed condition in Panama which interfered with the operation of the Panama Railroad, and as usual they straightened it out. They were kept busy putting down insurrections in various places, even as far as Alexandria, Egypt, clear up to the time of the Spanish War.

When the Spanish-American War began the strength of the Marine Corps was about 2,500 men, some aboard ships and others guarding navy yards. The detachments afloat took part in the battles in which their vessels were engaged, which included the famous battle of Santiago and the battle of Manila Bay, and many other engagements I could mention. Immediately after the Spanish-American War the marines were called on to take part in suppressing the Filipino insurrection. Owing to the nature of the country these operations included the severest kind of campaigning and the marines suffered serious losses.

Then the Boxer insurrection broke out in China in 1900, and because of threats against foreigners the Marine detachments from the U. S. S. *Oregon* and the U. S. S. *Newark* were landed at Tientsin, China, and dispatched to Peking to protect the American legation. In other words, the ever-ready marines were on hand at the right time and in the right place.

Again, in 1903 another marine expedition was sent to Panama to protect American lives and property, and a battalion was kept in the Canal Zone until 1914. In 1906 a brigade of marines was sent to Cuba to help Cuba put down an insurrection.

Owing to the disturbed conditions in Nicaragua in 1909, on December 20 of that year a force of marines was landed, and in May, 1910, was again sent to Nicaragua, and this was repeated in 1912, and I could go on and detail innumerable incidents where detachments of marines were sent first to one place and then another during each and every year for the purpose of protecting Americans or American property in foreign lands.

I want to call attention briefly to some of the services rendered in the World War by the marines. As a result of the declaration of war with Germany the Marine Corps during this year sent to France the Fourth Brigade of Marines, comprising the Fifth and Sixth Regiments and the Sixth Machine Gun Battalion. This brigade formed a part of the famous Second Division and took part in all the principal operations of the American Expeditionary Forces. These included the Aisne defensive, the capture of Belleau Wood and Bouresches; the Aisne-Marne offensive, including operations in the vicinity of Soissons; the St. Mihiel offensive, the capture of Blanc Mont, and St. Etienne, and the Meuse-Argonne. After the armistice the Fourth Brigade, as a part of the Second Division, marched to the Rhine and formed a part of the army of occupation, remaining there until July, 1919. A summary of the Fourth Brigade operations follows:

Toulon sector, Verdun: From March 15 to May 13, 1918.

Aisne defensive, in the Chateau-Thierry sector: From May 31 to June 5, 1918.

Chateau-Thierry sector (capture of Hill 142, Bouresches, Belleau Wood): From June 6 to July 9, 1918.

Aisne-Marne (Soissons) offensive: From July 18 to July 19, 1918.

Marbache sector, near Pont-a-Mousson on the Moselle River: From August 9 to August 16, 1918.

St. Mihiel offensive, in the vicinity of Thiaucourt, Xammes, and Jaulny: From September 12 to September 16, 1918.

Meuse-Argonne (Champagne), including the capture of Blanc Mont Ridge and St. Etienne: From October 1 to October 10, 1918.

Meuse-Argonne (including crossing of the Meuse River): From November 1 to November 11, 1918.

In addition to the Fourth Brigade four marine squadrons of land fighting planes and the headquarters company operated in northern France under the Navy as the day wing of the northern bombing group. Operations were carried on in the Dunkirk area against German submarines and their bases at Ostend, Zeebrugge, and Bruges. The total battle deaths of marines during the World War amounted to 2,454. The total number of casualties was 11,531.

After they had done their bit in the World War, then the same old police duty was assigned to the marines. For instance, during the year 1919 disturbances amounting to an insurrection occurred in Haiti, and it was necessary for the marine brigade occupying that country to take the field again. Peace was soon restored.

In 1920 armed guards, including marines from the U. S. S. *Albany* and the U. S. S. *South Dakota*, landed at Vladivostok, Siberia, and acted in the capacity of interallied police during the attempted overthrow of the government of that city.

In 1921 the Third Battalion of the Fifth Brigade sailed from Philadelphia, Pa., for special temporary duty in Panama on account of boundary trouble that had arisen between Panama and Costa Rica.

In 1921 so many armed robberies of the United States mails took place that a force of over 2,000 marines was organized and provided guards for mails in post offices, railroad stations, trains, and mail trucks. This duty lasted about three months, and during this period robberies of mails absolutely ceased.

In 1922 marines from the Asiatic Fleet and Station were sent to Tientsin, China, on account of disturbances arising from the civil war in that country.

The Japanese earthquake occurred in 1923, and marines from the U. S. S. *Huron* were landed to assist the American Embassy and American consulates and for relief work.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-four saw a serious revolution in Honduras. Marines were landed four times in several cities on the north coast of that country to protect American lives. The same year saw a provisional company of marines landed at Shanghai, China.

In 1925 there were further landing forces in Honduras and two landings of marine provisional units at Shanghai, and, as I have already called to your attention, last October 2,500 marines were again assigned the duty of protecting the mails, which they carried out in the same manner and up to the present date with the same success.

In view of the many, many incidents wherein the marines have been called on to protect American citizens and the property of American citizens, both here and abroad, only a few of which I have mentioned, it would be the height of folly to diminish this force. I agree with General Lejeune, when he stated to our committee:

Inasmuch as the Marine Corps must be an organization of "minute men" in order to carry out its mission of immediate service in support of the fleet in a major emergency, necessarily plans must be drawn up in advance and provisions made for carrying these plans into effect. To accomplish this it is essential that the corps should not be crippled by reducing its strength below the minimum necessary to permit it to furnish a well-trained expeditionary force for immediate service in a minor emergency and also to permit it to expand promptly and effectively on the approach of a major emergency. I am strongly of the opinion that the present strength—18,000 men—is, if anything, less than that minimum, and I am positive that it is not above it.

I want to say, in conclusion, I have always found the marines a busy bunch of men improving their conditions and surroundings, which would otherwise be a burden borne by the Government. General Lejeune stated in answer to a question asked him that the marines had adopted the principle that a man can properly be called on to work to improve his home; that he can be called on to do any kind of work to improve his home conditions.

In view of this willingness on the part of the marines, with their own labor to do all they can to improve these conditions it would seem that a grateful Nation should or could do more than has been done by this Nation in providing decent living conditions for its marines. I have been to Quantico and have seen the conditions under which these men with their families have to live. As has been said, housing conditions there are intolerable and would not be permitted for the civil population of any progressive community in this country, and are a disgrace. Until I visited Quantico and saw these conditions I could not believe they existed. I think the measure now before the Committee on Naval Affairs should be reported out immediately and passed, and an appropriation made during this session of Congress immediately available so that this deplorable condition can be cared for at an early date. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now arise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDELOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] to preside to-morrow during such time as the Speaker may be absent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURDICK (at the request of Mr. ALDRICH) for the remainder of the week on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 5, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, January 5, 1927, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the eradication or control of the European corn borer (H. R. 15649).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

Directing the Secretary of the Treasury to complete purchases of silver under the act of April 23, 1918, commonly known as the Pittman Act (S. 756).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels (H. R. 15336).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Secretary Davis to be heard in a discussion of items in the Army appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

841. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report showing the officers of the Government who were delinquent in rendering or transmitting their accounts to the proper officers in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1926, the cause therefor, and whether the delinquency was waived, together with a list of such officers who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

842. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

843. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Cass Lake and Leech Lake, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 4533. An act extending to lands released from withdrawal under the Carey Act the right of the State of Montana to secure indemnity for losses to its school grant in the Fort Belknap Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15129. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Indiana Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at Evansville, Ind.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1665). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (S. 2722) for the relief of the Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railroad Co., the successor in interest of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co., and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 15819) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 15820) to recognize the services of certain officers and enlisted men of the National Guard

or Organized Militia of the several States and of the District of Columbia during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 15821) to revise the boundary of the Hawaii National Park, on the island of Maui, in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 15822) authorizing the county of Escambia, Fla., and/or the county of Baldwin, Ala., and/or the State of Florida, and/or the State of Alabama to acquire all the rights and privileges granted to the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co., by chapter 168, approved June 22, 1916, for the construction of a bridge across Perdido Bay, from Lillian, Ala., to Cummings Point, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 15823) to establish a national farm commodity marketing association to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities, and to place the agricultural industry on a sound commercial basis, to encourage national cooperative marketing of farm products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 15824) to amend the national prohibition act to prevent the issuance of personal injunctions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 15825) to authorize the designation of deputy fiscal or disbursing agents in the Department of Agriculture stationed outside of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15826) to add certain lands to the Colville National Forest, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 15827) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act authorizing investigations by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce jointly to determine the location, extent, and mode of occurrence of potash deposits in the United States, and to conduct laboratory tests"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 15828) to prohibit certain assignments to duty in bureaus of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15829) regulating the mileage and other traveling allowances of members of the Officers Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 15830) to authorize an increase in the limit of cost of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 15831) to increase the efficiency of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15832) releasing and granting to the State of Washington any right, title, and interest of the United States in an island near the mouth of the Columbia River, commonly known as Sand Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 15833) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15834) authorizing appropriations for construction at military post; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 15835) for the further protection of fish in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. APPLEBY: A bill (H. R. 15836) to make additions, extensions, and improvements to the post-office building at Asbury Park, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 15837) to prohibit the use of time-measuring devices in connection with the work of employees of the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15838) to provide for the purchase of horses for the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15839) authorizing the Davis school district of Farmington, Utah, to secure water for the use of the South Weber School from the water supply of the Ogden ordnance reserve depot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 15840) to prohibit the prosecution under laws of the United States of a person for an act in respect of which he has previously been put in

jeopardy under the State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15841) to prohibit the admission of evidence obtained by unreasonable search or seizure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 319) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 320) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) creating a commission to investigate the subject of civil-service retirement and the operation and administration of the law relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property located in Hernando County, Fla., known as the Brooksville Plant-Introduction Garden, no longer required for plant-introduction purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 323) to approve a sale of land by one Moshulatubba; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) authorizing the use of a portion of that part of the United States National Cemetery Reservation at Chattanooga, Tenn., lying outside the cemetery walls, for a city pound, animal shelter, and hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) requesting the President to enter into negotiations with the Republic of China for the purpose of placing the treaties relating to Chinese tariff autonomy, extraterritoriality, and other matters, if any, in controversy between the Republic of China and the United States of America upon an equal and reciprocal basis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECK: Resolution (H. Res. 356) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to ascertain the extent and character of unofficial intermeddling in the foreign affairs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Resolution (H. Res. 357) upholding the President in maintaining the rights of the United States and of its citizens in Mexico and in Nicaragua, and in observing treaty obligations to the Nicaraguan Government recognized by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 358) providing additional compensation to Thomas F. Farrell and John A. McMillan; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 15842) for the relief of Capt. James P. Murphy; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 15843) granting an increase of pension to Sebina L. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15844) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 15845) granting an increase of pension to Walter T. Ponton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15846) granting an increase of pension to Frederick L. Eagle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15847) granting a pension to Anna L. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 15848) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15849) for the relief of Edwin D. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15850) granting a pension to Sarah J. Rea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15851) granting a pension to Samantha A. Mehinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 15852) for the relief of Max Hartenstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 15853) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Trotter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 15854) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McCue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 15855) for the relief of Clifford J. Sanghove; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15856) granting an increase of pension to Jacob G. Lobaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 15857) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McDavitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 15858) granting a pension to Pricilla Hillegas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15859) granting an increase of pension to Helen R. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 15860) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15861) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 15862) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Longworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 15863) for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 15864) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15865) granting an increase of pension to Rose R. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 15866) for the relief of estate of Katherine Heinrich (Charles Grieser and others, executors); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 15867) for the relief of Francis Sweeney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15868) granting a pension to Juliette Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 15869) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Dunning; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 15870) granting a pension to Mina Barden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 15871) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15872) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Zinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 15873) granting an increase of pension to Amy Lampman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 15874) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Gracey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15875) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15876) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Dively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15877) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 15878) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15879) granting an increase of pension to Emily Raber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 15880) granting a pension to Rachel F. Burd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15881) granting a pension to Eliza Towell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 15882) to credit the accounts of Rickings J. Shand, United States property and disbursing officer, Illinois National Guard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 15883) granting a pension to Martha Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 15884) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15885) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Six; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 15886) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Richeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 15887) granting an increase of pension to Eulalie Charboneau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 15888) granting an increase of pension to Della V. Kelsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 15889) granting a pension to Annie H. Kenny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 15890) granting a pension to Lydia Emmaline Dicus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 15891) for the relief of Mary R. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15892) granting an honorable discharge to W. G. Burress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15893) granting a pension to Jessie S. Erle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15894) granting a pension to Flora A. Haymaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15895) granting a pension to Florence A. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15896) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Marksbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15897) granting a pension to Melissa A. Trulock Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15898) granting a pension to Elizabeth Redding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15899) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Dennis; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4436. Petition of Religious Liberty Association of Tacoma Park, Washington, D. C., transmitting a petition signed by 163 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting the passage of House bill 10311; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4437. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Wellington, Kans., in behalf of legislation favoring Indian war veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

4438. By Mr. BURTNES: Petition of Rev. J. R. Weurich, pastor of the Community Church, Starkweather, N. D., concerning the amending of the preamble of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4439. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of J. B. Earl and 97 other residents of St. Clair, Mich., urging that there be no modification of the present immigration law to increase the quota, and urging passage of the deportation bill; to the Committee on Immigration.

4440. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, expressing opposition to the construction of a deep-water highway from Montreal, Canada, to Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

4441. Also, resolution of the Medical Society of the County of Kings, adopted at its regular meeting on December 21, 1926, held at the Medical Society Building, 1313 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing opposition to the Sheppard-Towner maternity act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4442. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Miss Mary L. Doyle, 257 E Street, South Boston, Mass., urging the enactment of prompt legislation to clear up the situation regarding radio broadcasting; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4443. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of Rev. W. J. Johnstone and 33 other residents of St. Paul, Minn., urging the enactment of House bill 10311; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4444. By Mr. KING: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by Geo. W. Anderson and 64 other citizens of Andover and Cambridge, Ill.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4445. By Mr. MAGRADY: Petition of sundry citizens of Berwick, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 10311, known as the Lankford Sunday rest bill, for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4446. By Mr. MAJOR: Petition of certain voters of Hughesville, Mo., urging passage of Civil War pension bill providing increase of pension for soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4447. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry citizens of Raynham, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4448. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petitions of citizens of Oregon, protesting against Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.